FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-136
Friday
15 July 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-136 | CONTENTS | 15 July 1988

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Soviet INF Inspectors Arrive in U.S. 14 Jul 1
Belgium Ratifies INF Inspection Agreement 1
GDR's Honecker Supports Gorbachev Initiative 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Political Committee Session Convenes 2
  Gorbachev Leads Delegation 2
  Soviet Group Arrives in Warsaw 2
  Polish Officials Meet Delegation *[PRAVDA 15 Jul]* 2
  Committee Begins Talks 2
  Session Participants Listed 2
Pact Defense Ministers Visit Soviet Units *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Jul]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

UN Security Council Begins Iran Airliner Debate 4
Gorbachev Greetings to Sofia Children's Forum *[PRAVDA 10 Jul]* 4
Perfilyev Foreign Ministry News Briefing 14 Jul 4
  Gorbachev European Initiatives 4
  Reaction to Gorbachev Proposals 5
  Yerevan 'Alleged Casualties' 5
  UN Cyprus Talks 'Necessary' 6
  'Inaccuracies' on Afghanistan 6
  Angola, Gulf, Other Issues 6
CEMA Economic Relationship With Europe Viewed *[Bykov in MOSCOW NEWS No 26]* 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. 'Piracy' in Persian Gulf Assessed 9
Reagan Holds Talks With Kuwaiti Premier 9
Vasilyev Assesses Shultz Central American Trip *[PRAVDA 10 Jul]* 9
Status of Presidential Campaign Described *[PRAVDA 11 Jul]* 10
Paper Cited on U.S. Aid to Polish Opposition *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Jul]* 12

China

Qian Qichen, Shultz Remarks in Beijing Reported 13
Li Peng Cited on USSR Ties, PRC Reform *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jul]* 13

Northeast Asia

Soviet Official Criticizes Japan's Takeshita *[Tokyo KYODO]* 14
Japanese 'Revanchist Campaign' Scored *[PRAVDA 12 Jul]* 14
Hokkaido Economic Team Visits Soviet Far East 15
Joint Fisheries Venture With Japan Noted 16
Foreign Ministry on Japanese Grave Visits 16
Commentator on USSR-DPRK Treaty Anniversary *[Levchev]* 17
Results of Kim Il-song Mongolia Visit Lauded *[PRAVDA 10 Jul]* 17

Mongolian National Day, Revolution Commemorated ... 18
  Envoy Marks National Day ... 18
  Gusev Attends Ceremony *[PRAVDA 9 Jul]* ... 18
  Soviet Leaders Send Greetings *[PRAVDA 11 Jul]* ... 18
  Thanks Sent for Greetings *[PRAVDA 12 Jul]* ... 19

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Gromyko Receives PRK's Heng Samrin ... 20
ASEAN Statement on Jakarta Talks Examined *[Alekseyev]* ... 21

Near East & South Asia

Bovin Views Afghan Rebel Opposition Divisions *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jul]* ... 21
Pakistan, U.S. Continue Afghan 'Interference' *[Vavilov]* ... 23
Human Cost of War in Afghanistan Cited *[TRUD 10 Jul]* ... 23
Rebel Military Activity in Afghanistan Reported ... 26
  20 Dead in Kabul ... 26
  Pakistani Advisors Noted *[PRAVDA 13 Jul]* ... 26
  Foreign Aid to Rebels ... 27
Women's Group Appeals for Release of POW's ... 27
Ministry Aides on Gulf Air Safety Problems *[IZVESTIYA 13 Jul]* ... 28
Gromyko Receives Iraq's Sa'dun Hammadi *[PRAVDA 14 Jul]* ... 29
  Hammadi News Conference *[Baghdad INA]* ... 30
Decisions of Algiers Arab Summit Reviewed *[PRAVDA 13 Jul]* ... 30
Supreme Soviet Chairmen Receive Egyptian ... 31
Condolences Sent to Gandhi on Train Disaster *[PRAVDA 10 Jul]* ... 32

East Europe

Further Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to Poland ... 32
  More Remarks to Krakow People ... 32
  Szczecin Visit Detailed *[PRAVDA 14 Jul]* ... 33
  Warsaw Speech to Intellectuals *[PRAVDA 15 Jul]* ... 36
  Polish Version of Castle Speech *[Warsaw Television]* ... 41
  Second Speech at Castle ... 44
  Meets With Journalists *[Warsaw Television]* ... 46
  Final Talks With Jaruzelski *[PRAVDA 15 Jul]* ... 47
  Joint Statement Signed *[PRAVDA 15 Jul]* ... 47
  Both Leaders Meet Journalists ... 52
  Medvedev, Czyrek Assess Visit ... 52

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Further on Unrest in Armenia, Azerbaijan Region ... 54
  Presidium Debate 18 Jul *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 29]* ... 54
  Yerevan Reports NKAO Vote ... 55
  TRUD on Stepanakert Situation *[15 Jul]* ... 55
  Stepanakert City Idle ... 55
  Stepanakert Transport Halted ... 55
  Stepanakert Situation 'Tense' *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jul]* ... 56
  Yerevan Strike Continues *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 15 Jul]* ... 56
  Output Lost by Yerevan Strike *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jul]* ... 56
  Kirovakan Situation Reported *[TRUD 15 Jul]* ... 57
  Arutyunyan Meets Workers *[Yerevan]* ... 57
  Yerevan Party Chief Replaced *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jul]* ... 58
  Armenian Patriarch Speaks *[Yerevan ARMENPRESS]* ... 58
  Armenian Poisoning Rumor *[PRAVDA 15 Jul]* ... 59
  Azerbaijan's Vezirov Interviewed ... 60

Paper Cites Ukrainian Nationalists' Demand *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Jul]* 65
Yakovlev Addresses Central Mass Media Forum *[PRAVDA 14 Jul]* 66
Dobrynin Addresses Activists Academy Graduates *[PRAVDA 9 Jul]* 69
Commentators Debate Restructuring Issues *[Bovin, Kobysh, Kondrashov in IZVESTIYA 9 Jul]* 70
Voter Terms Election 'Mockery of Democracy' *[IZVESTIYA 7 Jul]* 72
IZVESTIYA's Laptev on Glasnost, Privileges 75
KOMMUNIST's O. Latsis on Rehabilitations *[Milan L'UNITA 28 Jun]* 75
Weekly Reviews Anthology on Restructuring *[MOSCOW NEWS No 27]* 76
Weekly Ponders Soviet History 1917-1927 *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 6 Jul]* 78

Economic

'Voskhod' Bank Collapse in Zurich Discussed *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Jul]* .. 84

Agricultural

Progress of Feed Harvest, Storage Reported *[PRAVDA 7 Jul]* 86
Agricultural Developments for 7-13 Jul Noted 87

Scientific

'Cosmos-1958' Satellite Launched 14 Jul 88
Demonstration of Martian 'Rover' Vehicle Model 88
European Cooperation in Phobos Probes Cited 89
Foreign Insurance Representatives Visit Baykonur 89
    U.S. 'Ban' Creates 'Impasse' 90

Military

Yazov, Lizichev Address Graduation Ceremonies *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Jul]* 90

Soviet INF Inspectors Arrive in U.S. 14 Jul

LD1507052588 Moscow TASS in English 0521 GMT 15 Jul 88

[Text] Washington July 15 TASS—A group of 40 Soviet experts arrived in Washington Thursday to continue inspections of American military facilities to varify compliance with the intermediate-range nuclear forces treaty.

Early in July, the first group of Soviet inspectors visited five military facilities in the west of the United States, where missiles and their components, to be destroyed under the treaty, were or had been deployed.

Soviet experts carried out two more inspections in West Germany.

Over the same period, American inspectors checked 33 military facilities in Soviet territory.

During the current visit to the U.S., the Soviet inspectors will visit sites in Alabama, Maryland, Oklahoma and Florida.

Belgium Ratifies INF Inspection Agreement

LD1407215888 Moscow TASS in English 2041 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Brussels July 14 TASS—By TASS correspondent A. Balebanov:

The upper chamber of the Belgian Parliament, the Senate, unanimously endorsed today agreements signed by Belgium with the United States and the Soviet Union on holding inspections by Soviet specialists at the American units armed with cruise missiles on Belgian territory. The inspections are envisaged by the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

All members of the chamber, 167 senators, who were present at the plenary meeting voted for the agreement. There were neither "no" votes nor abstentions.

Earlier these agreements were unanimously endorsed by the lower chamber, the House of Representatives. Thus, the procedure of ratification of these international acts has been completed. The agreements will now be submitted for signing by head of the Belgian state, King of the Belgians Baudouin.

Ratification of the agreements was expected to pose no difficulties because no party in the country opposed the INF Treaty. Taking into account such unanimous support for the treaty from the public of the country, the Belgian Government, without waiting for the ratification of the agreements, gave the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union official obligations to observe their provisions, in particular, those concerning on-site inspections.

On the basis of the above mentioned agreements Soviet inspectors received the right to monitor in Belgium compliance with the INF Treaty. Inspections will be held at the military base in Florennes and at the European centre for servicing cruise missiles in the city of Gosselies.

GDR's Honecker Supports Gorbachev Initiative

LD1307205288 Moscow TASS in English 0824 GMT 13 Jul 88

[Text] Berlin July 13 TASS—The German Democratic Republic welcomes as extremely timely the new proposals made at the Polish Sejm by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to reduce military confrontation. They represent an especially important initiative aimed at building trust, strengthening security in Europe and continuing the disarmament process. This is said in a statement by Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic, published in the newspaper NEUES DEUTSCHLAND today.

The GDR, which is situated on the division line between the two military blocs, takes a keen interest in creating a military risk reduction centre in Europe which could provide for gradual cooperation between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, the statement runs. This initiative is closely linked to the GDR concept and the Polish and Czechoslovak proposals.

The document expresses support for the Soviet initiative to convene a pan-European summit meeting and readiness to take constructive part in its preparation and holding. Summit meetings, as experience shows, can only facilitate multilateral understanding in the field of disarmament and provide a further boost to talks at other levels.

The GDR received with special attention the Soviet proposals on the withdrawal of its forward-based air force if NATO agrees not to redeploy its 72 F-16 fighter bombers in Italy after Spain ordered them out, Honecker said. It also supports the initiative to reach an agreement on the priority reduction of tactical nuclear weapons, strike tactical aviation and tanks already at the beginning of the implementation of the plan of three-stage troops and arms reductions in Europe, and not at the third stage. This plan is also important because it provides for eliminating disbalances and asymmetries in the reduction of NATO and Warsaw Treaty troops by 500,000 from each side.

Warsaw Pact Political Committee Session Convenes

Gorbachev Leads Delegation

LD1407151988 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] The members of the Soviet delegation headed by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who is in Poland on an official friendly visit, left Moscow for Warsaw today to attend the regular session of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact states. Some members of the delegation—Comrade Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Comrade Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and Army General Comrade Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and minister of defense of the USSR—were seen off at the airport by Comrades Ligachev and Yakovlev, members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; Comrades Demichev and Maslykov, candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Poltiburo; and other officials.

Other members of the Soviet delegation—Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR; and Comrade Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had left for Warsaw earlier.

Soviet Group Arrives in Warsaw

LD1407191188 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Warsaw July 14 TASS—Members of the Soviet delegation headed by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, now in Poland on an official friendly visit, arrived here today for a meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee.

The following officials arrived in Poland: Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov, alternate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and defence minister of the USSR.

The other members of the Soviet delegation, Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, and Vadim Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had arrived in Warsaw earlier.

Polish Officials Meet Delegation

PM1507125588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jul 88 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "To the Political Consultative Committee Conference"]

[Excerpts] Members of the Soviet delegation headed by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who is on an official friendly visit to Poland, left Moscow for Warsaw 14 July to attend a regular conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. [passage omitted]

The members of the Soviet delegation arrived in Warsaw the same day.

The delegation members were met at the airport by W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of State; Z. Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers; and Army General F. Siwicki, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and Polish minister of national defense.

They were accompanied by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, who had arrived in Warsaw earlier.

Committee Begins Talks

LD1507082988 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 15 Jul 88

[Excerpt] The Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty countries is meeting in the Polish capital. It will discuss major problems of international relations, the strengthening of security and peace, and measures to reduce tension in the military field on the European Continent. Members of the committee are seven socialist countries of Europe, including the Soviet Union.

The Soviet delegation is led by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. During his just-ended official friendly visit to Poland he said the Soviet Union was going to the committee meeting with new constructive ideas and with a readiness to continue a peaceful and constructive course in international affairs. [passage omitted]

Session Participants Listed

LD1507090688 Moscow TASS in English 0855 GMT 15 Jul 88

[Text] Warsaw July 15 TASS—The Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries opened its conference in the Polish capital today.

The conference is attended by delegations of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, led by Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and chairman of the State Council of

Bulgaria; the Hungarian People's Republic, led by Karoly Grosz, general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers; the German Democratic Republic, led by Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and chairman of the State Council of the GDR; the Polish People's Republic, led by Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party and chairman of the State Council of Poland; the Socialist Republic of Romania, led by Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of Romania; the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, led by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party; and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, led by Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party.

The conference is also attended by Marshal of the Soviet Union Viktor Kulikov, commander-in-chief of the Warsaw Treaty Joint Armed Forces, and Henryk Jaroszek, secretary general of the Political Consultative Committee and Polish first deputy foreign minister.

Pact Defense Ministers Visit Soviet Units

PM1207140988 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Jul 88 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting With Soldiers"]

[Text] On 7 July members of the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers' Committee visited one of the units of the Kantemir Guards' Tank Division named for Yu.V. Andropov. They were acquainted with the life and combat training of guardsmen, they met with the personnel, and they inspected the training base.

The members of the Defense Ministers' Committee also visited the Air Force garrison at Kubinka, where they were familiarized with modern types of combat technology and arms.

UN Security Council Begins Iran Airliner Debate

LD1407183188 Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] New York July 14 TASS—The United Nations Security Council began a meeting here today at Iran's request to discuss the U.S. Navy's shooting down of an Iranian airliner with 290 passengers in the Persian Gulf.

The issue is being discussed at the request of the Iranian side separately from the Iran-Iraq conflict.

The Security Council was convened after days of consultations among its members and representatives of other nations. The meeting was even postponed for two days from the original scheduled date to allow the consultations to continue.

Speaking in the Security Council, Iranian Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati called the U.S. Navy's action the most inhuman in the history of civil aviation.

The tragic attack on the airliner had caused pain to people in Iran and around the globe and world opinion expected the United Nations to react adequately to the bloody murder of inocents, who had included more than 100 women and children and passengers from countries other than Iran, he said.

Velayati provided details of the plane's flight before being hit by a missile from the USSR Vincennes.

Despite claims by U.S. authorites that the airliner had strayed from the corridor reserved for commercial air traffic, all facts indicated, the Iranian foreign minister said, that it was absolutely not so and that such groundless claims were only aimed to mislead public opinion.

Gorbachev Greetings to Sofia Children's Forum

PM1507083988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jul 88 Second Edition p 1

[M.S. Gorbachev greetings message to "Peace Banner" Children's Assembly in Sofia]

[Text] To the participants and guests of the "Peace Banner" International Children's Assembly

Dear friends!

Recently I have had many occasions to meet emissaries of numerous children's organizations and movements from different countries. The planet's youth ardently wishes to grow up and develop without fear that life might end before it has hardly begun.

You have assembled at a time when mankind has perceived a ray of hope of deliverance from the danger of a nuclear conflagration. Tense struggle and hard work lie ahead to ensure that our world becomes nuclear-free and nonviolent, that people in it lead a quiet life, and that they can get down to their peaceful tasks, tasks which are numerous for all, tasks which are difficult and urgent.

With the passage of time, you will have to finish what the older generation has started. I am convinced that even now, youth can make its contribution to overcoming prejudices and mistrust, energetically furthering cooperation and mutual understanding among peoples.

I wish you success, dear friends!

M. Gorbachev

Perfilyev Foreign Ministry News Briefing 14 Jul

Gorbachev European Initiatives

LD1407151088 Moscow TASS in English 1346 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 14 TASS—"The new initiatives for the strengthening of security and confidence in Europe, advanced in the speech that General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev delivered in the Sejm of the Polish People's Republic, caused lively interest in public and official circles of countries of the European Continent and the whole world", Vadim Perfilyev, deputy head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said at a briefing in Moscow today.

"These initiatives are viewed as a fresh confirmation of the readiness of the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty countries to make a concrete contribution to the consolidation of stability, peace and security in Europe", he said.

Pointing to a lack of constructiveness in the initial reaction from some NATO countries, Vadim Perfilyev described this reaction as "extremely hasty".

The Foreign Ministry spokesman touched upon the proposal to hold a summit meeting of all European countries to discuss the question of conventional arms reduction. And he noted that the complexities that now emerged at the talks in Vienna on these matters require precisely the holding of such an authoritative meeting of European leaders that could break the present vicious circle in the matters of conventional disarmament and make it possible to embark on practical talks in the area.

Dwelling on the initiative for the creation of a nuclear risk reduction centre in Europe as a venue of cooperation between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, Vadim Perfilyev pointed to the need for and practical possibility of the existence of such a body for confidence-building, for real lowering of military confrontation.

Reaction to Gorbachev Proposals

LD1407185888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] A briefing was held today in the Press Center of the USSR Foreign Ministry on current issues of international politics. Speaking to Soviet and foreign journalists, Vadim Pavlovich Perfilyev, deputy head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said:

[Begin Perfilyev recording] A conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee is being held tomorrow in Warsaw. We are going into this conference with new and constructive ideas, and with a readiness to continue forther with our peaceloving and constructive line in international affairs. We are open to cooperation and prepared to look without prejudice at the present situation in Europe and in the world, and to seek mutually acceptable solutions together with our partners in the West.

As regards the initiatives put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev during his speech in the Sejm of the Polish People's Republic, they have generated and continue to generate a lively and interested reaction in European public and official circles, and indeed not only in Europe. These initiatives are being seen as fresh confirmation of the readiness of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact member countries to make a concrete contribution to securing stability in the world and security on the Continent of Europe.

However, it would be impossible not to remark upon the lack of a constructive attitude in the first reaction from several of our partners in European affairs and the NATO countries. Thus, judging by information from Washington, for instance, or London and Rome, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's proposal to withdraw Soviet similar aviation means from their sites of forward basing in Eastern Europe, if NATO agrees not to deploy in Italy 72 of its F-16 fighter-bombers which have been rejected by Spain, has met with a negative reaction. In our view, this negative reaction is extremely hasty. Again we are hearing the stereotyped references to the so-called geographical factor, and so on. The Soviet Union has paid attention to the generally favorable assessment of West European countries to the USSR's readiness for businesslike talks on a reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe, including a mutual asymmetrical reduction. It seems, however, that our Western partners could now speak out in more specific terms and more to the point on the three-stage program for the reduction of conventional troops and weapons set out by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary in the Sejm of the Polish People's Republic.

I shall not conceal that we expected more energetic support for the proposal to hold a summit meeting of all European countries to discuss the question of reducing conventional weapons. In this connection, we do not think it justified for the West to cite the discussions going on in Vienna on these matters. I would also like to hope that our proposal to set up a European nuclear risk reduction center as a venue of cooperation between NATO and the Warsaw Pact organization will be suitably assessed in Europe, in the NATO countries' capitals. [end recording]

Yerevan 'Alleged Casualties'

LD1407153888 Moscow TASS in English 1531 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 14 TASS—Had it not been for the latest dramatic developments relating to Nagorno-Karabakh, the programme of the autonomous region's social and economic development would have proceeded much faster, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said today.

Vadim Perfiliyev, deputy head of the Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, told a briefing at the ministry Press Centre that the possible ways of resolving problems relating to Nagorno-Karabakh were defined in Mikhail Gorbachev's February 26 address to the peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia.

The address pointed out, specifically, that it was inadmissible to deal with the most serious issues of people's destiny by relying on emotions.

In keeping with a resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, up to 400 million roubles are to be allocated for the region's all-round development.

Perfiliyev recalled that the 19th nationwide CPSU Conference found it expedient to set up at the USSR Supreme Soviet, the supreme soviets of the union republics and local governing councils, wherever necessary, standing commissions on inter-ethnic relations.

The conference also came out in favour of forming a special state body on nationalities and inter-ethnic relations.

It recommended reviewing laws in the union republics and autonomous entities, reflecting more fully their rights and obligations, principles of self-government and representation of all ethnic groups in the bodies of power in the centre and in the provinces.

On the issue of alleged casualties at Yerevan's Svarnots Airport, the Foreign Ministry spokesman stated that there had been "not a single human casualty" in the operation of clearing the airport of those who blocked its operation.

On the funerals in Yerevan, he said that one person died of a heart attack unrelated to the developments. The other one was fatally wounded when being with a group of people who attacked militia representatives far from the airport.

Commenting on the report about the confiscation of weapons by militia in Nagorno-Karabakh, the spokesman said that in the conditions when the situation was rather tense, it was only natural that law-enforcement bodies would undertake preventing actions of this kind.

"This does not mean, however, that there were instances of the use of these weapons," he added.

UN Cyprus Talks 'Necessary'

LD1407153188 Moscow TASS in English 1522 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 14 TASS—The Soviet Union believes that resumption of a constructive dialogue between the Cypriots, Greeks and Turks, under the U.N. aegis is absolutely necessary, said Vadim Perfilyev, deputy head of the Information Directorate of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR, at a briefing in Moscow today.

He expressed satisfaction with the beginning of positive changes that have lately been witnessed in the Cyprus problem, implying, specifically, prospects of arranging by U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar in the near future a meeting of Cypriot leaders Yeoryios Vasiliou and Rauf Denktas to discuss aspects of the settlement on the island.

The representative of the Foreign Ministry said that in the present-day conditions "envigoration of efforts in favour of convocation of an international conference on Cyprus within the U.N. framework with a view of settlement of external aspects of the Cyprus problem would meet the noble task of a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus issue."

'Inaccuracies' on Afghanistan

LD1407152688 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 14 TASS—Vadim Perfilyev, deputy head of the Information Directorate of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR, has pointed today to inaccurancies and even gross distortions of facts by some foreign mass media in covering Afghan problems.

Speaking at a briefing at the Press Centre of the Foreign Ministry, Vadim Perfilyev recalled that approximately ten years ago a mixed Soviet-Afghan archeological expedition found sepulchres with valuable gold articles in the north of Afghanistan. The valuables became known as the gold of Tellatip, by the name of the locality where the excavactions took place .

On May 15-17 this year, said Vadim Perfilyev, some Western mass media distributed a report on the occasion of the withdrawal from Afghanistan of the first unit of the limited contingent of Soviet troops, in which it was said that "a Soviet Army lorry with valuables was sent to Moscow". Most detailed information about that was provided by the French newspaper LE MONDE and the Italian LA STAMPA. Articles and reports also gave detailed information about the "stolen" valuables, for instance about a precious waist-band, a golden 17 cm high chamois, valued at over 5 million dollars. All those things were allegedly expected to be in Moscow before the end of May.

These fabrications were convincingly turned down by Italian journalist Umberto Solimene, accredited in Moscow, said the representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry. Umberto Solimene worked in Afghanistan on a film for the popular mixer programme. On July 9 he filmed the valuables of Tellatip which are kept, as before, in the vaults of the presidential palace in Kabul, and took an interview from the Director of the National Museum Anuhar Katawazi, who said that the reports on their stealing are lies. The sealed up vaults were opened before a TV camera, in the presence of a special commission.

Vadim Perfilyev presented to the Soviet and foreign journalists video material of the mixer filming group who returned from Afghanistan three days ago.

Journalists' attention was also drawn to a report by Radio Beijing with reference to some "Afghan news agency" in Islamabad concerning an explosion which allegedly took place in the president's residence in Kabul on July 6. Numerous casualties were mentioned in the report.

"All that are fabrications from beginning to end. There have been no explosion and casualties at the presidential palace," said the representative of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR.

Angola, Gulf, Other Issues

LD1407164688 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 14 TASS—In the course of the official friendly visit by Indian President Ramswami Venkataraman to the USSR the two states reiterated mutual resolve to facilitate a turn for the better in international developments, Vadim Perfilyev, deputy head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, told a briefing in Moscow today.

He reminded that the head of the Indian state, who stayed in the USSR on July 6-13, took part in the closing ceremony of the India Festival in the Soviet Union. "Regular Soviet-Indian meetings at summit and high level and the growing contacts between the governments of the two countries receive further boost from the diplomacy of the people, of which the national festivals of the two countries became vivid examples," Vadim Perfilyev said.

Touching upon Soviet-American relations, the Soviet spokesman made reference to the third round table of the representatives of the two countries on humanitarian issues which ended in Moscow on Wednesday. He described as another manifestation of the development of political dialogue between the two countries the forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union of a group of American senators, invited by the Soviet Parliamentary Group, on July 16-20.

At the same time the Soviet spokesman noted that the discriminatory practice of U.S. authorities against Soviet journalists did not contribute to building mutual trust. "At the American diplomatic department grotesque scenes are being acted out when armed guards escort Soviet journalists into the hall for briefings, which creates an unhealthy situation around each of the visits," he said. The process of accreditation of Soviet correspondents at the White House remains to be unjustifiably dragged out. Stringent rules remain in force regulating the trips by Soviet journalists around the USA.

Touching upon the recent expert meeting in New York within the framework of the talks on southern Africa between Angola, Cuba and South Africa, with U.S. mediation, Vadim Perfilyev said that "they in Moscow received with satisfaction the news about certain progress towards the political settlement of the South African conflict." He stressed that taking into account the balance of the interests was a key to solving the problems of southern Africa.

The Soviet spokesman told the journalists that Yuliy Vorontsov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, would visit Baghdad and Tehran next week in continuation of permanent contacts between the Soviet Union and the parties to the Iran-Iraq armed conflict. "We took and will take all efforts to bring this senseless war to an end as soon as possible," Vadim Perfilyev said.

CEMA Economic Relationship With Europe Viewed

WA18120088 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 26, 3-10 Jul 88 p 3

[Article by Aleksandr Bykov: "Stages in the Economic Euromarathon"]

[Text] Now, after 15 years of exhausting negotiations, the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and the European Economic Community (EEC) have official relations.

The drafting and signing of the joint declaration marked an important dsvelopment in East-West relations—and a victory over the old political mentality which caused the world's two largest integrated economic entities to virtually ignore each other, in defiance of common sense and European realities.

I admit I never caught the United States or Japan gloating over this state of affairs—though there were plenty of reasons for them to do so. While competing with New York and Tokyo in trade and technology, the EEC had no reliable instruments for cooperation with Eastern Europe, the need for which was evident, given the interests of both sides.

According to the EEC members, the EEC didn't want to cooperate with CMEA because an agreement between the two trading blocs would strengthen Soviet "hegemony" in Eastern Europe and would run counter to the legal status of the sides. It was the new round of talks started in 1985 (at CMEA's initiative—the first contacts were also initiated by the East) which broke the deadlock. The result was a well-justified compromise: a declaration on the establishment of official relations between CMEA and the EEC and simultaneous trade talks between separate CMEA countries and the EEC. A compromise was also reached on the so-called territorial provision concerning West Berlin.

Having given the EEC what it wanted, does CMEA stand to gain anything? Contrary to what some Westerners are saying, European cooperation is not a one-way street. Both sides are interested in the development of this cooperation. Nevertheless, in its talks with individual CMEA countries the Commission of the Euoropean Committees still uses a protectionist and differentiating approach. The EEC has yet to fully consider the interests and aspirations of its East-bloc partners. Thus close cooperation among CMEA countries in solving trade and economic problems is especially important. Closer cooperation will make individual countries less vulnerable before their powerful integrated partner, which is accustomed to calling the shots. We must realize that unity brings strength—and act accordingly.

Sometimes individual CMEA countries have only their own economic interest in mind, but this approach doesn't actually serve their best interest, nor the best interests of the community as a whole. Perhaps the time is right for the CMEA countries to set up their own common market—with their own customs rules and a coordinating trade policy with third countries—to strengthen their positions on the EEC and international markets. This would enable the CMEA countries to counter more effectively, individually and collectively, the discriminatory measures of the Western economic blocs and to make reciprocal and equivalent concessions in dealing with them.

Most importantly, the CMEA countries must expand their common export base, using their combined resources and economic links with the West. They must also determine the export specializations of individual members and the community as a whole, in conformity with the world market's demands and international competitiveness. This can be done by making greater use of national and joint (bilateral or multilateral) companies, including those partly financed by Western capital, and special economic zones.

Economically, Europe isn't made up of just the EEC and CMEA. There's also the European Free Trade Association (EFTA). The EFTA members are small, but they are mainly non-aligned countries, rapidly developing, with extensive trade and economic ties with the EEC and CMEA.

The CMEA countries are active with the EFTA countries, especially with Finland, Austria, Sweden and Switzerland, often more sensitive than other West European nations to the interests of their East European partners. Finland remains the only Western country to have, apart from strong bilateral contacts wtiht individual CMEA members, bilateral ties based on a corresponding agreement with CMEA.

The establishment of business contacts between CMEA and the EFTA is conceivable: the EFTA views this prospect rather favourably.

The finish of the economic Euromarathon race is still a long way off. A free-trade zone stretching from the Atlantic coast to the Urals might be one possibility.

United States & Canada

U.S. 'Piracy' in Persian Gulf Assessed

LD1400193800 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 14 TASS—A TASS correspondent writes:

Ten days have passed since an Iranian airliner was shot down by a U.S. missile over the Persian Gulf, but the storm of protests caused by this barbarous action does not subside.

Various aspects of what has happened—military-political, legal, moral—remain in the focus of attention of the whole world. As the circumstances of the shooting down of the A-300 Airbus and the perishing of some 300 of its passengers come to light, less and less people believe commander of the USS "Vincennes" that it had been a technical error. [sentence as received] The viewpoint that the disaster has been the logical consequence of the policy of the White House in the Persian Gulf, fraught with unpredictable consequences, becomes more widespread.

Washington showed the world what is the worth of its rhetoric about human rights, the value of human life. The shooting down of an airliner, the perishing of innocent people, among them women and children, showed where the banking on power politics, on the unprecedented build up of the armada of naval ships and airforce in this explosive area can lead.

Chief expert of the Institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences Viktor Bordunov, having analyzed the incident from the viewpoint of law, qualified the United States conduct as illegal with all the consequences to follow. In a conversation with Soviet journalists he recalled the amendment to Article 3 of the Chicago Convention adopted in 1984 which, specifically, says that every state should refrain from using arms against airliners in flight. The Soviet jurist noted that the United States that voted for the amendment has now grossly violated a most important principle of the international airspace law.

Actions of the U.S. military are assessed everywhere as international piracy, as the unwillingness to take into consideration generally recognized moral standards. And the attempts of the U.S. Administration to justify this crime by an "inalienable right to self-defence" are regarded as a manifestation of glaring hypocricy, PRAVDA's political news analyst Gennadiy Vasilyev writes today.

It is expected in the USSR that a meeting of the United Nations Security Council which opens today will condemn the United States provocative policy in the Persian Gulf and the barbarous action of the U.S. military. The United States should withdraw its naval force out of the region so that the cause of the recent drama be eliminated and new tragic events prevented.

Reagan Holds Talks With Kuwaiti Premier

LD1307193688 Moscow TASS in English 0624 GMT 13 Jul 88

[Text] Washington July 13 TASS—TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy reports:

U.S. President Ronald Reagan received on Tuesday Prime Minister of Kuwait Crown Prince Sa'd Abdallah al-Salim al-Sabah.

The Iran-Iraq war and diplomatic efforts to have it ended, the U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the U.S. Middle East policy, the situation in Lebanon, common financial and economic issues and also military potential of Kuwait and the planned sale of American F-18 fighter planes to it were discussed in the course of the meeting at the White House and also negotiations between the prime minister of Kuwait and First Deputy Secretary of State John Whitehead, the U.S. Department of State has reported.

Last week the Reagan administration informed the Congress of the intention to sell to Kuwait 40 F-18 fighter planes and also Sidewinder, Sparrow, Harpoon and Maverick missiles to a total sum of almost 2,000 million dollars. But the U.S. Senate disallowed the sale to Kuwait of 300 Maverick missiles, envisaged by this deal. This actually blocks the sale of F-18 planes, since they are inefficient without such missiles, the Department of State noted.

Vasilyev Assesses Shultz Central American Trip

PM1407152588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jul 88 First Edition p 5

[Political observer Gennadiy Vasilyev article under the rubric "Replying to Readers": "What Does G. Shultz's Baggage Contain?"—first two paragraphs are PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Readers K. Malakhov from Moscow, I. Baykov from Minsk, and others have written asking to be told about the objectives and results of the recent tour of Central American countries by U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz.

PRAVDA's political observer Gennadiy Vasilyev replies:

There is no denying U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz' energy, enterprise, and skill in untangling disputed questions. He has displayed these enviable qualities along several important avenues of U.S. foreign policy, especially in Soviet-U.S. relations. There are occasions, however, when no amount of persistence and no diplomatic skill can assure success. This happens mainly when the aims are unrealistic, when the policy itself is flawed. We have just witnessed one such occasion: The tour of Central American countries which the U.S. secretary of state has just concluded.

Within the space of 3 days, the indefatigable leader of the U.S. foreign policy department "covered" four countries in the region: Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica. Summing up the tour's results, M. Fitzwater, assistant to the President for press relations, described its purpose as follows: "During the meetings in Central America they (G. Shultz and the persons accompanying him—G.V. note) emphasized that the United States strives to help preserve and consolidate democracy in the region, to consult and cooperate in regional affairs. Discussions in every country centered on its problems. U.S. support was welcomed. Views on different questions were voiced. Naturally, all four countries are interested in the safeguarding of their own democracies and in the establishment of democracy in Nicaragua." Even this super-evasive answer gives rise to natural questions. What is behind the formulation that "U.S. support was welcomed?" And what if some country wishes to pursue an independent policy? Why is it that Washington, linking up other countries in this, is taking on the task of "establishing democracy in Nicaragua?" Are the Nicaraguans themselves incapable of doing this?

The statement by the White House spokesman has an imperial redolence and smacks of the old habit of behaving in Latin America virtually as if the place belonged to the United States. And what sort of "democracy," what sort of "peace" was actually at issue? It was no accident that the first question put to Fitzwater was: "Did the secretary of state enlist support for or assent to the resumption of military aid to the contras?" That was because the sharp edge of the policy pursued by Shultz on the spot was aimed against independent Nicaragua—as well as, let us add, against Panama, which is displaying "intransigence."

These questions were discussed with the leaders of the four countries and with the gangleaders of the anti-Nicaraguan contras. The visitor from Washington tried to get Central American countries to step up political and other pressure on Nicaragua at a time when Washington's policy, aimed at overthrowing the people's regime in that country by the hands of CIA mercenaries, has ended up in a blind alley and when this course is coming up against growing public opposition in the United States itself. Evidence of this can be seen in the unwillingness of the U.S. Congress to extend the provision of military aid to fugitive counterrevolutionaries.

The visitor from Washington pursued his objectives by purely American methods, handing out bank checks to back up his appeals. While in El Salvador, he signed an agreement on the provision of $125 million of economic aid to this country. The sum of $75 million was "forked out" to Guatemala, and $57 million was passed on to Honduras. One cannot fail to notice that the ranks of "beneficiaries" did not include Costa Rica where, according to an ABC correspondent, Shultz "found the least mutual understanding" and where the country's President Arias "told the secretary of state that the peace process in Central America is alive and there is no need to try and bury it."

In 1983, to the accompaniment of propaganda fanfares, the Reagan administration announced its "Caribbean initiative"—a long-term plan for military-economic aid to Central American and Caribbean countries designed to stabilize the situation in the region on U.S. terms. It is 5 years since that time, but peace and tranquility have yet to arrive in the region. The economic situation is severe, social contradictions are acute, and the only thing left from the entire U.S. "initiative" is the policy of U.S. military and political pressure—the intervention in Grenada, the undeclared war against Nicaragua, the attempts to suffocate Panama economically. With the exception of the disgraceful "victory" by U.S. arms in Grenada, this policy is producing one failure after another. It is becoming apparent that nowadays even the peoples in small countries can stand up for themselves, if they are prepared to defend the way of life they have chosen.

U.S. policy is failing to work in many regions in the world. It is not easy for the U.S. Administration to admit this. Especially in an election year, when the results of the 8 years that the Republican government was in power are being summed up. And so George Shultz is roaming the world. The Near East yesterday, Central America today, Southeast Asia and the Pacific tomorrow. He is trying to patch up the facade of Washington's foreign policy. But even the experience and skill that are typical of the secretary of state cannot always help. It all boils down to the "baggage" that the head of the U.S. foreign policy department takes along on his trips. It contains far too many elements from the past, from the time when a "pecking order" of large and small countries existed in the world, when the stick and the carrot served as Washington's effective tools.

Status of Presidential Campaign Described

PM1407131588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Jul 88 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Linnik dispatch: "U.S. Presidential Election. 'Dead Season' in Hot Summer"]

[Text] New York, Jul—The "dead season" in the present election campaign—the period between the conclusion of the primaries and the two parties' conventions—ends quite soon. The Democrats' convention (as congresses are called here) will open in Atlanta (Georgia) in a few days' time. It is to nominate Michael Dukakis as the presidential candidate, decide on the candidacy of his running mate, and approve the platform with which the Democrats will approach the November election. The

Republican Party's convention will take place approximately 1 month after this, and it, too, will in fact "rubber-stamp" the predetermined outcome—the nomination of George Bush as presidential candidate.

This year's campaign has never been distinguished either by a particular intensity of passions or by heightened press attention toward it. During these weeks, the topic of the election has altogether disappeared from the newspapers' front pages, having given way to news of Reagan's visit to the Soviet Union, the numerous scandals shaking Washington, the drought which has hit the country, the 19th party conference in Moscow, and also, in recent days, the Iranian aircraft tragedy. One can only guess at the reasons for such feeble interest in the present election marathon on the part of both the public and the mass media. Several explanations could be suggested with equal success, and quite convincing ones, too—ranging from the personalities of the candidates, who do not arouse particular enthusiasm, to the unprecedented heat.

Commentators here agree that the black preacher J. Jackson has been the most interesting contender this year. He demonstrated this right up to the very last day, when, despite the predetermined outcome, as many as one-third of the Democrats who participated in the primaries still voted for him. As a result, almost 7 million Democrat voters (or 29 percent of the total number who voted) cast their votes for Jackson at the first stage of the campaign, while almost 10 million people (or 43 percent) voted for Dukakis, the winner. But the Democratic Party's rules are such that, despite such a ratio in the votes of ordinary voters, Dukakis will be supported by twice as many delegates at the Atlanta convention. Having enlisted the support of approximately 1,000 convention delegates, Jackson with his supporters remains a force to be reckoned with inside the Democratic Party. This is why Dukakis is so wary of him. He is afraid to offer him the vice-presidency, for, according to the widespread opinion of experts and party professionals, that would doom the Democrats to defeat in November. But nor must he cast him aside, for Jackson controls a sizable bloc of Democratic Party voters without whose support Dukakis will not see victory.

During election campaigns, the candidates and the parties usually seek a key topic, a kind of "nail" that can be driven ceaselessly into the rivals' camp in order to "nail" them once and for all. And both candidates are now engaged in a search for such topics, or "nails."

The Republican Party has recently abandoned to a considerable degree the traditional election-time problem of the country's economic position and foreign policy. The economy is basically developing without upheavals. Inflation is being kept at a respectable level, and the progress in Soviet-U.S. relations has undoubtedly given the Republican Party an opportunity to notch up many points to its foreign policy credit.

Therefore, the Democrats are having to seek "nails" in other areas. They would like to raise the problem of corruption in the present administration, since there is no end of scandals in Washington today. The problem of G. Bush's capacity for leadership will also be touched upon. The latter will in turn try to mount his favorite hobbyhorse by arguing that Dukakis is "incompetent and naive" in foreign policy affairs. There is also an intention to use the slogan "Dukakis Means Taxes" against the Democratic candidate and to find fault with the "discharges" which Governor Dukakis introduced in his state for convicts serving their sentence in prison. All these topics could well become central during the election campaign because they are of considerable importance in themselves. But there are also disagreements between the candidates on fundamental issues. In the economy and in foreign and military policy, Bush has willy-nilly been forced to appear in the role of Reagan's heir and, therefore, support the Reagan administration's general course.

Dukakis is seeking to find his own political persona during the campaign. While supporting the administration's policy in relations with the Soviet Union, he sharply censures Reagan's policy in Central America, southern Africa, and the Persian Gulf. Following the Iranian aircraft tragedy, he recently reaffirmed the pressing need to withdraw the U.S. fleet from the Persian Gulf. At the insistence of Jackson's supporters, the Democratic Party's platform to be approved by the Atlanta convention already includes a definition of the RSA as a "terrorist state" with which the United States must end all relations.

Dukakis declared in a recent speech in Washington to the Atlantic Council public organization that he is opposed to SDI, the creation of the Midgetman mobile missile, and also the deployment of MX missiles in the numbers planned by the Republicans. At the same time, he advocates increasing capital investments in enhancing the combat capability of conventional armed forces and arms.

Thus, on the whole, Dukakis clearly stands to the left of his rival on his foreign policy views.

In the economic sphere, the question of taxes is being noisily debated. Bush promises on oath not to raise taxes "under any circumstances." Dukakis gives an equally solemn assurance that he will do so only "in an emergency." Such an emergency came about rather quickly, however, in his own state of Massachusetts: The governor quite recently raised taxes by $120 million. Naturally, the Republicans at once seized on this as an indicator of the Massachusetts candidate's true intentions.

The unwritten canons of U.S. political life require vice-presidential candidates to be selected according to one general principle: They must, as far as possible, offset the "weaknesses" or vulnerable spots of the main contenders. This "balancing" act presupposes, to put it crudely, that someone from the Northeast needs as his running mate a Southerner or a resident of the Midwest, a Catholic needs a Protestant, and a liberal needs a conservative. This was the basis on which J. Kennedy plumped in the past for L. Johnson. In 1980 Reagan chose G. Bush according to a different indicator: as the rival who had garnered the largest number of votes after himself during the primaries. Incidentally, J. Jackson stresses precisely this precedent, above all, in offering his candidacy to Dukakis.

Two people on the list of hopefuls—Senators B. Bradley and S. Nunn—have announced their refusal to run with Dukakis. Those now remaining on the list are Senators J. Glenn, R. Graham, and L. Bentsen and Congressmen L. Hamilton and T. Foley. The Dukakis headquarters has issued special questionnaires to them and also to J. Jackson. The competitors for the vice-presidency are asked to provide information on very intimate questions ranging from financial affairs to their state of health and also to answer, for example, whether the applicant has been arrested by the police for driving while intoxicated.

Bush still has time to ponder the options, but R. Dole and H. Baker are being mentioned increasingly frequently as his possible running mates.

At all events, the choice of both contenders' running mates is at present the only intrigue providing food for the local mass media in connection with the presidential campaign.

Who seems to have the better chances?

This, as we say, is the "big question" or, as the Americans put it, the "$64 million" question. Only 3-4 weeks ago, the polls were showing Dukakis 13-15 points ahead of Bush in terms of popularity with the voters. The gap between the aspirants has recently narrowed to 4-5 points in Dukakis' favor—which, taking into account the percentage of error in polls, is statistically insignificant. The ratio now stands at 46 to 41 percent in Dukakis' favor. The flow of voters' sympathies away from him has not been accompanied by an automatic growth in Bush's popularity. The voters lost by Dukakis have switched to the category of "undecided." All this means that the campaign is essentially only beginning and will, in all probability, result in an extremely negligible gap between the votes for Bush and Dukakis.

It seems to me that this year has confirmed one rule of U.S. political life that local propagandists do not much like to enlarge upon. The politicians with the fattest purses have become both parties' presidential candidates this year. I wish to specify that it is not a question of this being the precise reason why Bush and Dukakis became their parties' candidates. Perhaps they attracted big money to themselves, as it were, because they were considered the most promising contenders. But the fact remains that money lubricates the U.S. political machine, and the more of this lubrication there is, the more smoothly this machine runs.

Seeking to give at least some flavor to the present insipid election campaign, the local mass media have unearthed G. Bush's genealogical tree. It turns out that royal blood runs in his veins, for he is a 13th cousin of the present British Queen Elizabeth. We must now await the response of Dukakis, whose grandfather, as was already known, was a shepherd on the Greek island of Lesbos.

But what can you do: It is a hot summer, the "dead season...."

Paper Cited on U.S. Aid to Polish Opposition

PM1507081588 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Jul 88 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "What Are the Overseas 'Benefactors' Up To? The United States Poses Political Conditions in Exchange for Aid to Poland"]

[Text] New York, 11 Jul—THE NEW YORK TIMES reports on the flagrant interference in Poland's internal affairs being carried out systematically, overtly, and on a large scale by the U.S. Government and the Congress.

After analyzing U.S. Government documents and polling a number of officials and also Polish emigres, the newspaper obtained a detailed picture of this activity. "Together with Polish emigres," THE NEW YORK TIMES points out, "the U.S. Government has mounted a broad campaign designed to help 'Solidarity' and the Polish underground to smuggle into Poland press publications, printing equipment, radio apparatus, and videos. The publications in question include thousands of books and journals containing sharp criticism of the communist system and Poland's leader Wojciech Jaruzelski. Moreover, in the last 3 years the United States has paid out more than $5 million in aid to 'Solidarity' and other groupings opposing the Warsaw government."

The newspaper describes various channels through which overseas aid infiltrates Poland. Some of the funds, the newspaper points out, are openly allocated by the Congress: Last July $1 million and in December another 1 million were appropriated. Furthermore, the money is distributed through the so-called "National Foundation in Support of Democracy"—an organization which, while being private and independent pro forma, in fact "receives almost all its funds from the federal government" and "consults the State Department on all its grants." It is through using funds from this foundation that various emigre "centers" in the United States and Western Europe operate, centers which inundate socialist Poland with torrents of disinformation and slander. Peter Mroszak, the leader of the so-called Washington "Solidarity Foundation," stated frankly in an interview with THE NEW YORK TIMES that his organization "serves as a channel" for transferring funds from the U.S. foundation to "youth, church, and political organizations." Jozef Lebenbaum, leader of the Swedish-based "Independent Polish Agency," admits that his organization also lives on U.S. money.

Antigovernment elements in Poland are extremely afraid of "accusations that they serve as the tool of Western intelligence services," THE NEW YORK TIMES points out. At the same time its own revelations leave no doubts that such suspicions are quite well founded.

China

Qian Qichen, Shultz Remarks in Beijing Reported
LD1407211388 Moscow TASS in English 2017 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Beijing July 14 TASS—The signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles signifies an important step made by the Soviet Union and the United States on the long road of nuclear disarmament, said Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China Qian Qichen. He made a speech at the reception in honour of the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, now in Beijing on an official visit.

The call for a peace settlement of international conflicts was as strong as never before, he underlined. East-West relations have already started advancing towards detente. This is a trend to replace confrontation by dialogue.

Noting positive changes in the Chinese-American relations, the foreign minister of the People's Republic of China said that their further development depended on both sides' strict compliance with the five principles of peaceful coexistence and observance of the provisions of the joint communiques.

George Shultz, on his part, said that the INF Treaty would be followed by a whole number of American-Soviet arms control negotiations: on 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive armaments, on reduction of conventional armaments in Europe, on non-proliferation of chemical weapons.

During his stay in the People's Republic of China George Shultz is to meet member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Premier of the State Council Li Peng, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communsit Party of China Zhao Ziyang, Chairman of the Central Military Commission of the People's Republic of China Deng Xiaoping, the XINHUA news agency reports.

Li Peng Cited on USSR Ties, PRC Reform
PM1407075588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Interview With Li Peng"]

[Text] Beijing, 8 Jul—The newspaper RENMIN RIBAO has published an interview given by Li Peng, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee and premier of the PRC State Council, to Japanese journalists concerning certain aspects of PRC foreign policy and important problems in the country's socioeconomic development.

Touching on Sino-Soviet relations, Li Peng said in particular that in recent years relations between the PRC and the Soviet Union have improved considerably in many areas, first and foremost in the sphere of the economy, trade, science, technology, culture, and education. Nonetheless, he noted, there has still been no improvement [ne dostignuto sdviga] in bilateral political relations. In his words, the main thing hampering the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations is the Cambodia question. Li Peng also linked the prospects for a Soviet-Chinese summit with the resolution of this issue. China, he stressed, invariably advocates the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations.

With regard to restructuring in the USSR and the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, Li Peng stated: The general thrust of the restructuring, being implemented on the initiative of Soviet leader M.S. Gorbachev, is correct. We hope that the Soviet Union will be able to overcome its difficulties and achieve successes in restructuring. China has closely followed the progress of the 19th all-union party conference, which was an "event of great importance in the process of the restructuring being carried out in the USSR."

Talking about the forthcoming informal meeting in Jakarta on the Cambodia problem, the head of the Chinese Government noted that the recent PRC Foreign Ministry statement had demonstrated that in the new situation China has "taken a more positive and flexible position on a rational political resolution of the Cambodia question," and drew attention to Vietnam's statement that it will withdraw 50,000 of its servicemen from Cambodia in the course of this year. "If this is done, such an act will be assessed in the proper manner," Li Peng said. He advocated the creation of a four-party coalition government in Cambodia under the leadership of Prince Sihanouk. In the event of agreement being reached on a settlement of the Cambodia problem, China—in the words of the premier of the PRC State Council—is prepared, together with other countries, to be an international guarantor of its implementation.

Concerning the problem of price and wage reform in the PRC and the relationship between economic growth and economic stability, Li Peng stressed that economic stability means "maintaining long, stable, and rational economic growth with rational development rates." The aim of the price reform currently under development, he said, is to move from the highly centralized planning structure practised in China in the past toward a socialist, planned, goods economy in which the law of cost will play a more important role.

Following a question from journalists about the discontent expressed by some students and people in connection with price growth, the low pay of the intelligentsia, bureaucratism, civil service corruption, and unhealthy phenomena in the party and in the sphere of social morals, Li Peng noted that critical statements with regard to these problems are a normal phenomenon. The ruling party and the government, he pointed out, must take active and effective measures to gradually resolve these problems.

To the question of whether there is any opposition to the Chinese reform, the premier of the PRC State Council stated: "It should not be said that there is no opposition. However, I must note that we are implementing political reform quite successfully. We have successfully embarked on the gradual implementation of certain targets outlined by the 13th CPC Congress. Among these are the delineation of party and administrative functions and the transfer of rights to grassroots organs."

Northeast Asia

Soviet Official Criticizes Japan's Takeshita

OW1407091788 Tokyo KYODO in English 0849 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Tokyo, July 14 KYODO—Senior Soviet Communist Party official Ivan Kovalenko criticized Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita on Thursday for trying to internationalize a Japan-Soviet territorial problem and to create new tension, Japan Socialist Party [JSP] officials said.

Kovalenko, deputy director of the Soviet Communist Party's International Department, lashed out at Takeshita for allegedly urging U.S. President Ronald Reagan to bring up Japan's claim on four islands near Hokkaido during a superpower summit in Moscow in early June.

Kovalenko, a Kremlin expert on Japan affairs and fluent Japanese speaker, made the comment in a two-hour meeting over lunch with JSP leader Takako Doi at a Tokyo Hotel, the officials said.

Reagan, however, did not take up the matter in the Moscow summit with Kremlin leader Mikhail Gorbachev, Kovalenko was quoted as saying.

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz told Japanese leaders in London in early June that the United States put forth the Japanese territorial claim to the Soviets, according to the Japanese Foreign Ministry. But the Soviet Union made a cool response to it, ministry officials reported.

Shultz was present at the London meeting between Reagan and Takeshita. Reagan briefed Takeshita about the outcome of the superpower summit. At that time, Takeshita was on a tour of Europe after attending the United Nations special session on disarmament in New York.

Kovalenko said he thinks that Western nations would ignore Japan's claim and would not wish to get involved in the issue.

The Soviet official said that to ask foreign countries to help in resolving a bilateral problem could create an international problem and lead to new tension.

The Soviet Union seized four islands off Hokkaido immediately after World War II and maintains that there is no territorial issue with Japan.

Doi called on the Soviets to implement perestroyka not only in Europe but also in Asia, the officials said.

Kovalenko replied that the Soviet Union is carrying out perestroyka in Asia by eliminating its SS-20s there, by withdrawing its troops from Mongolia and Afghanistan and improving relations with China.

Kovalenko, who is leading a four-member Soviet Communist Party delegation, arrived here Monday for an eight-day visit at the invitation of the JSP.

Japanese 'Revanchist Campaign' Scored

PM1407155988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Igor Latyshev dispatch under the "Viewpoint" rubric: "In the Thrall of Dangerous Illusions"]

[Text] Tokyo—The recent meeting in Toronto of the leaders of the seven leading countries in the capitalist world confirmed once again that the spirit of antagonism and military confrontation between the two camps, which had dominated the political outlook of participants in previous meetings, is begining to dissipate. Hints of a readiness on the part of the United States and its allies to embark on further talks with the Soviet Union on problems concerned with reducing the threat of nuclear war appeared in the declarations made by the "Seven" in Toronto, unlike on previous occasions. Certain positive shifts that have occurred in international relations as a result of the Soviet-American summit talks received recognition.

However, not all participants in the Toronto meeting showed readiness to recognize the new realities of international life and revise their former prejudiced attitude toward the Soviet Union and the idea of reducing nuclear arsenals. This primarily applies to the Japanese leaders—Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita and Foreign Minister Sosuke Uno. Judging by the commentaries of the Japanese press itself, Takeshita and Uno, unlike a number of leaders of Western countries, remain champions of the former "cold," "hard-line" approach to the the Soviet Union. This is indicated, for example, by Takeshita's claim that the restructuring being carried out by the USSR leadership "has had no effect at all upon Soviet policy in Asia." The prime minister even alluded to Soviet expansionist aspirations in Asia and the the Pacific. He also alleged that the Soviet Union was "building up" the combat might of its armed forces near

Japan—in the so-called "northern territories." The aim of such statements is, according to Japanese commentators, to "caution" Western countries against trusting the Soviet Union.

It is indeed a paradoxical situation: Now, at a time when a real opportunity for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons is appearing for the first time, the Government of Japan—the only country to have experienced the horrors of atomic bombs—is openly inclining toward support of the doctrine of "nuclear deterrence," which points the world in the direction of holding on to these barbarous weapons ad infinitum. This is evidenced by a speech the Japanese prime minister quite recently delivered to officers of the Japanese Defense Academy. "The facts confirm," he stated in the speech, "that modern international society and peace and security throughout the world only exist thanks to the deterring balance of forces, including nuclear weapons."

But the Japanese Government's reluctance to help improve the international climate in the Asian and Pacific regions is shown above all in its desire to stir up a revanchist campaign by making illegitimate territorial claims against the Soviet Union. The meeting in Toronto was, it turns out, the first conference of the leaders of the "Seven" at which Japanese representatives started up provocative discussion of the long-solved "territorial question," aimed essentially at revising the results of World War II.

It is now becoming obvious that the deliberately unfriendly stance toward the USSR adopted by the Japanese Government is a manifestation of a new political course elaborated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and expounded recently in the press by an anonymous "leader" of the above-mentioned department. The thrust of the course is that during the period of restructuring in the Soviet Union the Japanese side should intensify its territorial claims, presenting them in a tough, categorical way as a precondition for any Soviet-Japanese accord on questions of economic cooperation.

It thus seems that strong-arm diplomacy is now fundamental to Japanese policy toward the USSR. It is not fortuitous that in Japanese conservative circles the voices of those who espouse the absurd thesis that restructuring in the Soviet Union is the result of outside pressure have grown louder. Proceeding from this absurd assumption, some leaders of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party comfort themselves with the illusion that further strengthening of diplomatic pressure on Moscow, bolstered by Japanese military preparations and the support of other Western countries, will make the USSR revise the Soviet-Japanese borders.

It only remains to express astonishment at how removed from reality the Japanese politicians in thrall to these dangerous illusions are! It is about time they realized the futility of any revanchist hopes. The maintenance of tension in the Far East and further stagnation in the development of Soviet-Japanese relations can be the only consequence of their ill will.

Hokkaido Economic Team Visits Soviet Far East

OW1307170988 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 9 Jul 88

[From the "Soviet Far East News" program]

[Excerpts] Here now is a dispatch from Khabarovsk City: Some days ago, a Hokkaido economic delegation, led by Lieutenant Governor Tsuneo Ueda, visited the Soviet Far East. Meetings were held in Khabarovsk City and Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk City. These meetings represented a continuation of dialogue that began when Governor Takahiro Yokomichi visited the Soviet Union in September last year. Governor Yokomichi and Khabarovsk Kray Soviet Executive Committee Chairman Danilyuk then signed their names to a memorandum on developing friendship and cultural, trade, and economic relations between Hokkaido and the Soviet Far East.

Concrete issues were discussed extensively during the recent visit to Khabarovsk City by the Japanese delegation. The two sides exchanged views on the need to develop and improve trade, economic, and scientific-technological relations. According to chief of the Soviet delegation Avel Morozov, deputy chairman of the Khabarovsk Kray Soviet Executive Committee and chairman of the Kray's Planning Committee, the two sides reached a decision regarding the prospects of their regional cooperation.

The Soviet side explained to the Japanese delegation about the perestroyka now under way in the Soviet Union, including the Far East economic zones and Khabarovsk Kray, to improve the entire system of external economic relations.

In an interview granted to a Radio Moscow reporter, Mr Tsuneo Ueda, head of the Japanese delegation, made the following remarks on his delegation's talks in Khabarovsk City:

[Begin Ueda recording] I am Hokkaido Lieutenant Governor Ueda. I am here as head of our delegation. [passage omitted] Our delegation visited various places. The regional delegations of the two sides held energetic, separate debates on commerce and industry, agriculture, fishery, and forestry. For example, in the field of commerce and industry the two sides discussed the way joint ventures should be operated and decided to make a feasibility study for the supply of [words indistinct] machinery, and manufactured goods. In the field of agriculture, they agreed to take practical measures to exchange [words indistinct] on crops including [word indistinct] wheat and pasture and promote related technical interchanges. Concerning fishery relations, the two sides agreed to set up a system for consultations among fishermen in the Far East [words indistinct] at the proposal of the fishery authority in Khabarovsk Kray. In addition, the Soviet side agreed to make a full study on a scheduled visit by a Hokkaido producers' group to Khabarovsk Kray. The visit is scheduled for sometime between July and September this year. In the field of forestry, the Soviet side promised to make preparations to meet a Hokkaido delegation [words indistinct] in the Far East. Of course, the two sides also agreed to conduct technical exchanges. The Hokkaido delegation expressed the hope that in return for our visit, the Khabarovsk side will send its economic exchange team to Hokkaido without fail. We were told that our request would be studied fully and positively in Moscow. I am confident that by repeating such [word indistinct] exchanges the two regions will strengthen their friendship, thereby contributing greatly to peace in the world. Thank you. [end recording]

Joint Fisheries Venture With Japan Noted

LD1207203988 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 12 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS—The sphere of the activity of the first Soviet-Japanese joint venture in the fisheries ranges from reproduction and fishing to ship repair and the construction of fish-processing factories. The documents on the setting up of the joint venture were signed here today by heads of three Soviet fisheries organisations and of the Japanese joint stock company Hokuyo Godo Suisan which was recently set up expressly for the organisation of joint production.

The new enterprise, Pilenga Godo, in Yuzhno Sakhalisnk, Sakhalin Island, will initially be engaged in breeding salmon. A plant for artificial hatching of chum salmon is planned to be built on the river Pilenga next year. The young of this variety of fish will be released into the river so that grown fish will return there in three or four years. Part of this stock of fish will then be caught by the joint company.

The sides will at once invest over 4 million roubles into the joint venture. The share of the Soviet partners is 51 per cent, of Japan—49 per cent. The board will consist of three representatives of the Japanese joint stock company and three representatives of the Soviet organisations.

It was learnt from the USSR Ministry of Fisheries that negotiations are now under way about setting up several other Soviet-Japanese enterprises on the USSR territory. The development of this form of cooperation was preceded by the establishment of closer economic, scientific and technological ties in this branch between the USSR and Japan. Joint exploration of marine resources in the northwestern part of the Pacific has been conducted over many years. There have been mutual fishing operations in the 200-mile economic zones of the two countries. There is trade in fishing and processing equipment.

Foreign Ministry on Japanese Grave Visits

OW1307171388 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 9 Jul 88

[Text] Recently a Moscow Radio reporter visited the Pacific and Southeast Asian Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry. There this reporter heard the Soviet Foreign Ministry's answers to questions posed by Moscow Radio. We will now report on the exchange in a question and answer form.

Question: At the recent Japanese-Soviet working-level consultations, the question of Japanese citizens' visits to graves on Soviet territory was taken up for discussion along with other questions. How did the discussion go?

Answer: As you know, there are more than 20 Japanese graveyards on Soviet territory. They mainly entomb Japanese military personnel who died during World War II or after the war. The Soviet side wishes to state that there are graves also in Japan for Soviet soldiers and officers who were prisoners of war during the 1904-05 Russo-Japanese War.

With due regard to the humanitarian nature of the grave visiting issue and taking the Japanese people's national and religious sentiments into consideration, the Soviet Union took a bold course 2 years ago by simplifying travel procedures for visiting graves. As a result, a Soviet-Japanese agreement was reached in July 1986 on unified procedures for visiting graves. Under the agreement and on the basis of the reciprocity of Japanese and Soviet citizens groups, it has now become possible for Japanese and Soviet citizens to visit their respective ancestral graves on Soviet or Japanese territory with identification cards only and without entry visas.

During the period since this agreement was reached, it is believed that Japan has been convinced that the Soviet Union is giving very favorable and careful examination to all questions concerning visits by Japanese people to graves on Soviet territory.

During the 1986-87 period three groups of Japanese citizens visited graves on Suisho and Shikotan Islands in the Kuriles, as well as a number of islands on Sakhalin and [words indistinct]. They are allowed to bring flower baskets with them from Japan or hold memorial services during their visits to the graves.

The Soviet side should mention that it is always exerting efforts to expand places where Japanese can visit graves. Last year Japanese grave-visiting groups were able to visit Uglegorsk and Tomari in Sakahlin Oblast and (?Chernshi), a town in (?Ivanov Oblast), in addition to the places where they had previously been visiting. We intend to proceed along this line in the future, too, and plan to make it possible for Japanese grave-visitors to visit more places, which will likely be made available in the days ahead. As a matter of fact, this point was discussed at the Soviet-Japanese working-level consultations in Moscow.

Question: Can progress of some kind be expected this year with respect to Japanese visits to graves?

Answer: Permission is granted for visits by special Japanese grave-visiting groups to the following graves on Soviet territory: Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Kholmsk, Poronaysk, Chekhov, Uglegorsk, Tomari, Dolinsk, and Korsakov. The period for Japanese grave-visiting groups to visit there is from 2 to 9 August. Next, (?Tarak) Island, (?Shibotsu) Island, Shikotan Island, and (?Dmitrovan). The visiting period here is from 23 to 26 August. In addition, they may visit Nakhodka for 3 days in September.

Thus, Korsakov, Dolinsk, (?Shibotsu) Island, and (?Tarak) Island were newly added to a list of places where Japanese have heretofore been visiting.

Question: What is the significance of Soviet-Japanese exchanges of this form?

Answer: As you can see, the Soviet side is showing goodwill toward humanitarian questions in the course of resolving all questions arising from Japanese citizens' interests. We, of course, expect that this attitude will be given a due appraisal in Japan.

The Soviet side is also convinced that such an attitude will play an important role in increasing trust and mutual understanding, as well as in strengthening goodneighborliness and the spirit of cooperation between the two countries.

Commentator on USSR-DPRK Treaty Anniversary

SK1407061488 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 5 Jul 88

[Station commentator Levchev commentary]

[Text] The day 6 July, which marks the 27th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the Soviet Union and the DPRK, is an important day in the history of relations between the two countries. In this connection, station commentator Levchev writes as follows:

The treaty signed 27 years ago established relations [as heard] between the two countries and has become a good foundation for the joint action to consolidate the overall development of relations between them, as well as peace and security in the Far East.

The ties between our two countries have been strengthened and developed in all fields. These ties are equal and independent and have served in utilizing the superiority of the socialist system.

There are many examples of mutual (?cooperation) between the two countries in the fields of electricity and energy and in the industries of ferrous and nonferrous metal, coal, and chemical industries. Approximately 70 enterprises have been built in the DPRK with the economic and technological cooperation from the Soviet Union. These enterprises have become the industrial foundation in this country.

In recent years, contacts between the CPSU and the Workers' Party of Korea have been developed actively. A (?plan) for mutual visits of leaders of the two countries at the supreme level is also under (?consideration). At their recent meeting, Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev and Comrade Kim Il-song reached the view that it is very important to further deepen trade and economic ties, to [word indistinct] them, and to jointly study new ways for scientific and technological cooperation.

It is clear that economic growth should be further enhanced for the (?peace of the future). The Soviet-Korean relations have been based on mutual understanding and mutual support on important issues. The two countries consider the strengthening of the struggle against the policy of aggression and war and for the preservation of global peace as the people's most important task. The Soviet Union highly evaluates the DPRK's foreign policy to alleviate tension in Korea and to create conditions for the country's peaceful reunification.

The development of the Soviet-Korean relations has been remarkably increased in the international arena where [words indistinct].

The DPRK highly evaluates the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit. Pyongyang considers the start of the implementation of the treaty of abolishing intermediate- and [word indistinct] missiles as a (?first step) in the cause of nuclear arms reduction. This is of very important significance in normalizing the military and political situation in Asia and the rest of the world.

The Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance signed in 1961 between the Soviet Union and the DPRK has been [words indistinct]. Developing the treaty for friendship with socialist countries is precisely the preferential direction of the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

Fraternal ties and cooperation between the people of the Soviet Union and the DPRK will be strengthened in the future to the benefit of the two countries and for peace and security in Asia.

Results of Kim Il-song Mongolia Visit Lauded

PM1407140588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jul 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Results Approved"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 9 Jul—The Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee Politburo approved the results of the official friendly visit to Mongolia by Kim

Il-song, general secretary of the WPK Central Committee and DPRK president, and of the talks held during the visit with J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Mongolian People's Great Hural Presidium, an information report published here today says. The fraternal friendship and cohesion between the two parties, countries, and peoples, the information report notes, will continue to strengthen and develop.

Mongolian National Day, Revolution Commemorated

Envoy Marks National Day

LD1207121988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 11 Jul 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today, the Mongolian people mark their national festival, People's Revolution Day. Tserengiyn Gurbadam, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Mongolian People's Republic to the USSR, is taking part in our program.

[Begin Gurbadam recording in Russian] Dear Comrades. During the years of people's power, the face of Mongolia has changed radically. We have scored great successes in developing the economy and culture, and raising people's living standards. Our people's creative efforts have been directed toward accelerating the country's social and economic development.

It is extremely pleasant for me to note that the victory of the people's revolution and the successes achieved by us are indissolubly linked with the ideas of Great October, with Leninist friendship, which binds our peoples together, and with the invaluable help and support of the Soviet Union. Today, it is the main task of our all-around cooperation to deepen this bond and to boost its effectiveness. In this respect, great importance is attached to the meetings between Comrades Batmonh and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and to the implementation of the long-term program of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation, as well as the program of cooperation in ideology, culture, science, and education.

An important spur to Mongolia's accelerated development will be provided by the realization of the long-term concept of the external economic ties between our countries. Mongolia is following with fixed attention the development and deepening of perestroyka, glasnost, and democratization of society in the Soviet Union. We are delighted that the 19th all-union party conference upheld the objective character and irreversibility of perestroyka, which has come to be a factor of world-wide significance. The Mongolian people links its creative plans with removal of the threat of war and the strengthening of universal security. Therefore, Mongolia conducts a policy of peace and cooperation, especially in Asia.

We hold in high esteem the results of the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, which was a direct result, primarily, of the constructive, realistic policy of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries.

Comrades, on this festive day, allow me, on behalf of the Mongolian people, to convey to the fraternal Soviet people sincere good wishes for happiness and further successes with revolutionary perestroyka.

I thank you for your attention. [end recording]

Gusev Attends Ceremony

PM1207153588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Ceremonial Meeting"]

[Text] A joint quest for optimal ways to improve mutually beneficial cooperation and the sides' genuine equal rights and responsibility—these are the basic principles governing Soviet-Mongolian relations. This was mentioned 8 July at a ceremonial meeting of the representatives of Moscow's working people to mark the 67th anniversary of the Mongolian People's Republic.

The speaker—K.Ye. Fomichenko, deputy chairman of the Soviet-Mongolian Friendship Society Central Board and USSR deputy minister—noted that the multifaceted ties between the two countries are continually being developed in all spheres of cooperation. Ts. Gurbadam, Mongolian ambassador to the Soviet Union, gave an account of the Mongolian working people's resolution of the tasks of socioeconomic development. The close collaboration between our peoples and between the MPRP and the CPSU, he said, serves as an important factor for the country's comprehensive renewal and prosperity.

A.A. Mokanu, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, V.K. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations took part in the meeting.

Soviet Leaders Send Greetings

PM1507104988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jul 88 Second Edition p 1

[Undated greetings message from Soviet leadership bodies to Mongolian leaders on revolution anniversary]

[Text] To Comrade Jambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Mongolian People's Republic [MPR] People's Great Hural Presidium

Comrade Dumaagiyn Sodnom, chairman of the MPR Council of Ministers

Dear Comrades!

On behalf of the Soviet people we send you, the MPRP Central Committee, the MPR People's Great Hural Presidium and Council of Ministers, and all working people of fraternal Mongolia cordial congratulations on the national holiday of the 67th anniversary of the people's revolution.

Your country's advance along the path opened up by the 1921 revolution has been marked by profound transformations and major achievements in all spheres of the life of the Mongolian people who, under the MPRP's leadership, have accomplished a historic breakthrough from feudalism to socialism and are now resolving the tasks set by the 19th MPRP Congress of accelerating their motherland's socioeconomic progress.

The MPR makes a weighty contribution to the elaboration and realization of the socialist community countries' peace-loving foreign policy, and our Mongolian friends' constructive efforts actively promote the implementation of the idea of restructuring relations in the Asia and Pacific region in the spirit of the new political thinking.

The victory of the Mongolian People's Revolution laid the sound foundations of the truly internationalist alliance and all-around cooperation between the CPSU and the MPRP and between the USSR and the MPR. Soviet-Mongolian friendship, sealed by the joint struggle and labor of many generations of builders of the new life, has always reliably served and continues to serve both countries' interests, which are organically blended with our common responsibility for the fate of the cause of socialism and peace. The process of restructuring in the Soviet Union and the MPRP policy of renewing Mongolian society are creating still more favorable conditions for further deepening and enhancing the efficiency of political and economic cooperation, spiritual contacts between our countries and peoples, and cooperation between the USSR and the MPR in the world arena.

Fulfilling the decisions of the 27th congress and the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, we will do everything to ensure that fraternal Soviet-Mongolian relations continue to strengthen, develop, and improve.

We wish you, Dear Comrades, and the Communists and all working people of the MPR new achievements in socialist building, happiness, and prosperity.

The CPSU Central Committee

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

The USSR Council of Ministers.

Thanks Sent for Greetings

PM1307131588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 88 Second Edition p 4

[Mongolian party and government leaders' message of thanks to Soviet counterparts for greetings on 67th anniversary of Mongolian revolution]

[Text] To Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Comrade A.A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

On behalf of the MPRP Central Committee, the Presidium of the Mongolian People's Great Hural, the Mongolian Council of Ministers, and all our country's working people and on our own account we express sincere thanks to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Council of Ministers, the fraternal Soviet people, and you, dear comrades, for your cordial congratulations and best wishes to us on the 67th anniversary of the Mongolian People's Revolution, which was a turning point in the Mongolian people's destiny.

Profound historical changes, which have altered our country beyond recognition, have occurred on Mongolian soil in the past years. Mongolia, formerly extremely backward socioeconomically, is now a genuinely free and prosperous country advancing confidently along the path of building socialism. Our people are today making determined efforts to successfully implement the MPRP's course of further accelerating the country's economic and social development through renewing and democratizing the life of society.

We express deep satisfaction at the present high level of and prospects for the further development of all-around Mongolian-Soviet cooperation based on the unshakable principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. Genuine fraternal friendship and all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union and its multfaceted aid and assistance have always been and continue to be of vital importance in augmenting Mongolian working people's revolutionary gains and solving tasks concerned with the country's socioeconomic progress.

We are firmly convinced that the indissoluble Mongolian-Soviet friendship will reliably serve the common interests of the peoples of our two countries and the interests of peace and socialism.

The Mongolian people value and understand Soviet people's work and concerns, their colossal efforts, and their plans and high aspirations for the triumph of the Leninist ideals of socialism, peace, and justice. Our country's Communists and working people ardently and sincerely welcome the historic decisions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, whose implementation will undoubtedly lead to the all-around deepening of the revolutionary process of restructuring, the improvement of socialism as a whole, and the scaling of new heights in the creation of a stable and nonviolent world for the good of all mankind.

We wholeheartedly wish you, dear comrades, and the fraternal Soviet people new successes in implementing the historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th all-union party conference and in the struggle for lasting peace and the security of the peoples.

J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the Mongolian People's Great Hural

D. Sodnom, chairman of the Mongolian Council of Ministers

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Gromyko Receives PRK's Heng Samrin

LD1407150188 Moscow TASS in English 1423 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 14 TASS—Andrey Gromyko, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and Heng Samrin, general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea and chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, had a meeting in the Kremlin today.

Heng Samrin made a stopover in Moscow en route to Cuba and Nicaragua where he will pay official visits.

Andrey Gromyko and Heng Samrin devoted special attention to exchanging opinions on the Kampuchean issue. They noted with satisfaction that as a result of the active and constructive policy of Kampuchea and Vietnam important changes for the better have been taking place lately in the situation in Kampuchea and around it.

These changes were described by Heng Samrin who pointed to the started large-scale withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteers from Kampuchea and the efforts of many countries to organize an "informal meeting" of four Kampuchean sides in Indonesia, which are to be joined at the second phase by interested states of the region, as the more significant factors in this respect.

Andrey Gromyko declared Soviet support for the position set forth on the issue in the final communique of a recent special meeting of the foreign ministers of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea.

Both sides expressed the hope that the forthcoming "informal meeting" in Jakarta will be a truly positive event which will facilitate progress to a political settlement of the conflict. Much will depend on the position of the People's Republic of China. It is important now to avoid such steps and statements that can hinder the Jakarta meeting in accordance with the formula agreed upon by the countries of Indochina and the ASEAN states or can pose obstacles to achieving mutual understanding between the Khmer sides.

Andrey Gromyko and Heng Samrin agreed that in the light of Vietnam's decision to withdraw its volunteer troops from Kampuchea completely by 1990, or even earlier than that if a political settlement is worked out, priority is going to the guarantees of preventing the genocidal regime from being restored in Kampuchea and of putting an end to any outside interference in that country's domestic affairs.

The Soviet side reaffirmed the Soviet people's solidarity with the Kampuchean working people who are successfully building a new life.

Backing was expressed also for the Kampuchean Government's policy of national reconciliation.

The Soviet Union supports the idea of holding an international conference on Kampuchea and reiterates its readiness to take a most fruitful part in it and together with other states to act as a guarantor of accords between the conflicting sides.

Heng Samrin voiced sincere gratitude for the Soviet Union's solidarity and its support to the People's Republic of Kampuchea at an important phase in its development.

Both sides expressed deep satisfaction with the successful development of relations of friendship and cooperation between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea and between the USSR and the PRK and stressed the common resolve to continue steadily broadening Soviet-Kampuchean cooperation and increasing its efficiency.

Note was taken of the importance of developing parliament-to-parliament ties and contacts between mass reorganizations.

Andrey Gromyko briefed Heng Samrin on the results of the 19th national party conference, pointing out specially that it has been a milestone event in the life of the CPSU.

The results of the forum mean that the party's line of revolutionary renewal in Soviet society, radical economic reform and democratization in every aspect of the Soviet people's life is being consistently carried out.

The task now is to realize the decisions taken by the conference as quickly and fully as possible.

On behalf of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the Soviet leadership Andrey Gromyko conveyed to Heng Samrin the best of wishes regarding his visits to Cuba and Nicaragua, which are common friends of the Soviet Union and Kampuchea.

At the end of the conversation Heng Samrin said that the meetings with Soviet leaders always give him a moral boost and enthusiasm. He wished success to the Soviet people engaged in a breath-taking perestroyka effort keynoted by the decisions of the 27th Congress of the CPSU and the 19th national party conference.

The meeting passed in a cordial, comradely atmosphere characteristic of the fraternal relationship of the CPSU and the PRPK.

Later today Heng Samrin left Moscow for Havana.

ASEAN Statement on Jakarta Talks Examined

BK1407070688 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1330 GMT 13 Jul 88

[Text] The conference of Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Lao foreign ministers was held in Phnom Penh on 11 July. In the statement issued on the outcome of this conference, the three Indochinese countries expressed their attitude toward the meeting among the four Cambodian parties to be held at the end of July in Bogor, Indonesia. Our political observer Comrade Alekseyev writes the following in this regard:

What is interesting is the three Indochinese countries' desire to get reasonable results from the meeting. What should be done to achieve this goal? In the opinion of Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos, first of all, efforts should be made to ensure that the consultative talks on the Cambodian situation strictly respect Cambodia's sovereignty. The Cambodian people alone have the right to discuss the issue of building Cambodia's state structure, set up the country's future government, and resolve other internal issues. No country, no matter how good its intentions, should interfere in Cambodia's internal affairs or impose its political will on Cambodian parties attending the forthcoming meeting. Along with this, as stated in the decision of the three Indochinese countries' foreign ministers, ASEAN circles are trying to give this meeting in Bogor an international character and to turn it into a political negotiation between Cambodia and Vietnam. It is in this way that the ASEAN foreign ministers raised this issue at their recent conference in Bangkok.

The communique of the meeting in Phnom Penh said that such an attitude grossly obstructed the trend of dialogue among Khmer factions within the framework of national reconciliation. For this reason, such an attitude is unacceptable.

Near East & South Asia

Bovin Views Afghan Rebel Opposition Divisions

PM1507093988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by IZVESTIYA political observer A. Bovin: "Afghanistan: Counterrevolution Resists"]

[Text] "There is not and cannot be revolution without counterrevolution." This idea comes from V.I. Lenin. All the experience of the revolutionary movements of the 20th century confirms it. Political leaders, parties, classes, and social groups advocating the radical revolutionary transformation of social relations inevitably encounter opposition.

Of course, in every country the correlation of the forces of revolution and counterrevolution, the scale and duration of the struggle between them, and the outcome of this struggle have their own features and appear different. In principle social progress cannot be halted; sooner or later, in one way or another, it will carve its way. But in a specific historical situation, in a given place, and at a given time, movement along this path can be substantially slowed down, halted, and even reversed....

Mentioning these general tenets of revolutionary theory makes sense in order to have a better understanding of the situation in Afghanistan, which remains extremely complex, contradictory, and unstable.

The revolution is restructuring its ranks by ridding itself of the mistakes of the past and overcoming the consequences of ultra-left excesses and of anticipating events. The republic's leadership is continuing the policy of national reconciliation. A new political system is being formed for neutral nonaligned Afghanistan. A National Council has been elected. The government headed by M.H. Sharq with its broad social base has won a vote of confidence. Kabul has repeatedly confirmed its readiness to include representatives of the political opposition and the leaders of rebel groups in the power structure both at the center and at local level.

Unfortunately, the opposition rejects Kabul's constructive proposals. On 19 June a list of ministers in the so-called "transitional government" headed by Ahmad Shah Mas'ud—a well known military figure in the Islamic counterrevolution—was published in Peshawar. Judging by press reports, Islamabad supported the "transitional government." The press writes that President Ziaul Haq has set the rebels the task of seizing power and creating an "Islamic state" within 6 days of the completion of the Soviet troop withdrawal. Michael Armacost, U.S. undersecretary of state, has spoken approvingly of the "transitional government."

At the same time, many field commanders (heading armed groups on the territory of Afghanistan) and also refugee leaders had an extremely skeptical attitude toward Mas'ud's "government," regarding it as the fruit of intrigues, rivalry, and compromise in Peshawar emigre circles.

Former King Zahir Shah has proposed another option: the convocation on Afghan territory of a traditional Loya Jirgah (a large meeting of tribal leaders) and the resolution of the question of a government on the basis of national consensus. This idea was supported by Diego Cordovez, former representative of the UN secretary general for the settlement of the situation around Afghanistan (he is now Ecuador's minister of foreign affairs and is taking part in Afghan affairs, so to speak, on a personal basis). It seems that some leaders of the Peshawar emigres are privately not opposed to the convocation of the Loya Jirgah, but officially all the "Seven" have rejected this option, since it tolerates PDPA participation in the government.

Disagreements and disputes over the Loya Jirgah are only the top layer of the profound contradictions characterizing the Peshawar emigres, among whom a multitude of groups, interests, and personal ambitions clash. One emigre pamphlet—"Jihad and Its Manipulators"—describes the overall situation in the following manner: "...Nonexistent parties with just an emblem, a flag, and a handful of men operate in Pakistan. After hastily growing a beard, renting a room, putting in a few chairs, and spreading out pamphlets stolen from the offices of other parties, the leaders of these parties announce that their aim is jihad, after which they set about collecting funds on this pretext. People calling themselves emirs head these nonexistent parties with their emblems. There are dozens of emirs. There are different kinds of emir. Some become emirs only to serve God and save Afghanistan. Others do so not only for God and to save Afghanistan but also to gain political power. Yet others become emirs solely to gain political power. And some do so for trade, to obtain money, and to share refugees' allowances." Official and unofficial representatives from Pakistan, Iran, the United States, Saudi Arabia, Britain, France, the FRG, Japan, and a number of other countries take an active part in preparing the nourishing broth around which all these self-styled emirs swarm and in feeding and supplying them with weapons and munitions.

As a result of natural and artificial selection, seven "legitimate"—as they call themselves—organizations, which now form the "Islamic Alliance of Afghan Holy Warriors," were gradually singled out from the jumble of rival groups. This alliance incorporates two factions. The moderates comprise three groups, headed by Sayyed Ahmad Gaylani (now chairman of the "Islamic Alliance of Afghan Holy Warriors"), Sebghatullah Mujadeddi, and Muhammad Nuri Muhammadi. The four extremist groups are led by Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, Burhanuddin Rabbani, Muhammad Yunis Khalis, and Abdul Rasul Sayyaf. Both groups resolutely oppose the present political regime in Kabul. But their social bases, programs, and their approach to a settlement are different.

The moderate traditionalist groups represent the interest of semifeudal strata, the tribal nobility, the big bourgeoisie, and the theological elite. The extremist fundamentalist groups, whose views are close to those of the "Muslim Brotherhood," are linked with the reactionary section of the petit urban bourgeoisie and the middle urban strata as a whole. It is easy to see that the social base of the members of the "Islamic Alliance of Afghan Holy Warriors" is quite narrow. The scope and scale of the counterrevolution are conditioned by the fact that during its first stages, the revolution was unable to win over to its side the peasantry, a considerable proportion of which supported the rebels. However, objectively the interests of the peasantry are decidedly at variance with the interests and tenets of the "Seven." The fate of the revolution (and counterrevolution) in many respects is dependent on the Afghan countryside's realization of this fact.

The "Alliance of Three" advocates the return to former "traditional" pre-Daoud ways and the restoration, if possible, of the monarchy. These groupings do not exclude a political compromise solution. The "Alliance of Four" rejects the possibility of any agreements with the present authorities and advocates the continuation of hostilities until Kabul completely capitulates. "The Four" also reject cooperation with the former king. "The people," SHAHADAT, the organ of G. Hikmatyar, wrote, "are hunting the king following his escape in order to hand him over in irons to an Islamic revolutionary court. Since he himself offered to return, let him come to the dock under his own steam."

What do the Afghan fundamentalists want? Let's examine, for instance, the program of the "Islamic Party of Afghanistan." It claims that all mankind's misfortunes and troubles have arisen because people obliterated from their hearts the "expectation of the Day of Judgment" and do not see the "invaluable teachings of God's chosen prophets as the basis of daily life." Only the establishment of "a salvational Islamic regime" can provide people with "equality" and "justice" and eliminate the "oppression and exploitation." Moreover, the creation of such a regime and the creation of an "Islamic state" are not confined to Afghanistan's borders. We resolutely support peace, Muslim fanatics state. "However, from our viewpoint, the absence of war does not mean peace and security. In order to ensure genuine security, "Islamic order" must triumph everywhere in all countries. So extremism in internal policy goes hand in hand with extremism in foreign policy.

It must be pointed out that after Khomeyni came to power in Iran the concept of the "Islamic state" with Islamic justice, Islamic culture, and an Islamic economy and the concept of Islamic society in opposition to both the West and the East became particularly fashionable.

But the practice of those countries where the authorities are embarking on the path of radical Islamization shows that the idea of Islamic "justice" remains utopian and an "Islamic state" actually means authoritarian rule by a narrow privileged stratum, which generally relies on the army and on a ramified apparatus of violence. That is the future that the counterrevolutionary "Alliance of Four" is preparing for Afghanistan—with clear support from Pakistan.

The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, which is continuing according to schedule, is intensifying polarization in the opposition camp. The choice to be made is becoming an increasingly acute problem—either political solutions or the continuation of the fratricidal war. While in Islamabad recently, D. Cordovez called on everyone to heed the "voice of reason, flexibility, and compromise." The people who do not want to heed this voice, who persist in their intransigence and do their utmost in their endeavors to exacerbate the situation and their patrons will bear the responsibility for the further victims, the further bloodshed, and the further sufferings of the Afghan people.

Pakistan, U.S. Continue Afghan 'Interference'

LD1407154888 Moscow TASS in English 1427 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 14 TASS—TASS news analyst Valeriy Vavilov writes:

Three months have passed since the signing of the Geneva accords on political settlement of the situation relating to Afghanistan. It has opened the road to an end to a fratricidal war, to the establishment of peace and tranquility in long-suffering Afghan land.

What has been achieved over these three months? It should be noted that blood is still spilt in Afghanistan and that the loss of life has not decreased. Rockets launched by fanatics from units of the armed opposition hit the streets of Kabul and other Afghan cities. Dynamite trucks blow up in crowded bazaars, causing death of women, children, old people.

Why is it that fratricidal bloodshed goes on? The Kabul authorities unswervingly observe the spirit and the letter of the agreements, take every possible measure to establish peace. Conducting the policy of national reconciliation, Kabul makes compromises, invites everyone who cares for the destiny of the motherland to take part in the setting up of a new coalition government on a broadest of basis, to share the authority and responsibility. This call is addressed also to those who have been waging the armed struggle against the Kabul government for a long time. There are portfolios of ministers, including defence minister, in the current government in Kabul for leaders of the opposition.

The Soviet Union fulfils its obligations unswervingly: The schedule of the Soviet troops withdrawal is strictly observed and half of the Soviet military contingent will be home in a month.

But Islamabad and Washington do not manifest the wish for a political settlement. Backing armed opposition groups basing in Pakistan, supplying them with weapons, assisting the transportation of commandos from the training centres in Pakistan's territory to Afghanistan, Islamabad glaringly violates the accords. Press reports show that not limiting itself to direct material and moral support for the armed opposition, Islamabad has decided to use Pakistani Armed Forces—artillery units and paramilitary militiamen units—in direct operations against the Afghan army for the seizure of some Afghan cities.

The setting up by the Afghan opposition of a so-called "transitional government" in the Pakistan territory which claims the right to speak for the entire Afghan people, while it does not represent it at all, is a new gross violation of the Geneva accords. Allowing that "government" to operate from the Pakistani territory, Islamabad actually directly violates its commitments not to interfere in internal affairs of the neighbouring country.

Isn't it time Islamabad and Washington heed the voice of reason and stop interference in the internal affairs of sovereign Afghanistan, stop placing roadblocks on the way from confrontation to peace? One gets the impression that Washington has either "forgotten" or deliberately ignores its obligations to be a guarantor of the Geneva accords. It does not use its influence on Pakistan to ensure that Islamabad stops interfering in the internal affairs of the neighbouring country.

It is only the unswerving observance of the agreements, only the implementation of the course at national reconciliation that can bring to Afghanistan long-awaited peace. The adversaries of political settlement obviously play with fire as the escalation of the interference can lead to very serious consequences for Islamabad and for the whole region.

Human Cost of War in Afghanistan Cited

PM1407144588 Moscow TRUD in Russian 10 Jul 88 p 3

["First part" of special correspondent B. Leonov "Afghan Diary": "The Long Journey Home"]

[Text] Kabul-Moscow—Wasps are teeming over the bushes in the dense orchard adjacent to the "Kabul" Hotel. They are rushing to take the drops of nectar that nature has intended for them. And on the streets of the city people are rushing, scurrying somewhere, carrying all kinds of possessions: One is carrying an armful of logs, which the merchant sells directly from scales with enormous trays hanging from chains. Another carries half a sack of flour to hold a rare festive event in his family with freshly baked cakes.

The drivers of the shabby, dented buses recognize no signals apart from sound signals and with their constant horn blowing muffle the word "baksheesh" (give), which is very frequent here and with which the numerous cripples displaying the stumps of their arms and legs and the children unable to hide such a natural desire to eat something reach out to the passers by.

The morning air, as yet free of gasoline fumes and dust, is so transparent that you can see every stone on the slopes of the mountains surrounding Kabul and the apertures of the windows with their broken glass in the adobe huts clinging like wasps' nests to the perpendicular cliffs. And above all this is the distinctive smell of unleavened bread just taken from the oven.

Suddenly a deafening crash descends on the street. The sound of glass being broken can be heard and the ancient mountains instantly echo these sounds. The wasps, like flower petals, scatter with the wind. But people continue imperturbably to drag their sandals along the uneven sidewalks and the word "baksheesh" is heard again.

Soon Kabul radio would report the latest bloody act of the "freedom fighters"—the explosion of a truck packed with dynamite. Then we would see the maimed and scorched sections of the chassis where through the soot there appear landscapes of peaceful oriental cities and the ornamental scrip of quotations from the Koran about peace and tranquillity. We would learn the number of victims—the children killed or crippled, who had been swarming in the sticky Kabul dust, and their mothers who had been busy in their houses since morning.

However sad and painful, this is a characteristic feature of the capital's present life. Life under the sign of the Afghan spring, whose arrival was awaited not only in wounded and unsettled Afghanistan but also throughout the world. A spring which will go down in world history and will become one of the year's main events.

This spring began in Geneva, where an agreement on a settlement of the question around Afghanistan was signed in April. It is continuing with the withdrawal of the Soviet military units returning home. The first convoy under the command of Colonel Starov spent 3 days traveling from Jalalabad to Termez. Some 600 km in a difficult and dangerous journey on which, fortunately, no dushman mines and shells were exploded and the submachine guns and grenade throwers of the "mujahidin" did not strike the armor of the armored personnel carriers and the tarpaulin-covered trucks.

But this journey must be measured by different yardsticks. Above all by the many long years since that day in December 1979 when Soviet soldiers entered Afghanistan. And however you explain that step—by concern for the security of our southern borders or the repayment of an international duty to a friendly neighboring people—every year of those slightly more than 8 years still seemed an eternity to those who thought every day and every night of their son or brother, husband or fiance in the scorching Afghan heat and awaited their return. For some people this journey was so remote that their whole life was not enough to enter their father's house and embrace their nearest and dearest. For many thousands of boys, home became one of the zinc boxes which the AN-26—the "black tulip"—grew tired of delivering from Kabul to Tashkent. The aircraft flew at night with lights extinguished so that those who had already died the death of the brave somewhere in the Salang pass or at Khowst should not fall once more to the dushman missiles.

Over one-third of the Soviet servicemen have already returned to the motherland. The latest subunit left the territory bordering on Pakistan recently. We are pleased to meet our boys on their native soil, although it is difficult not to think about how their road home could have been far shorter.

Those who continue to deliver weapons and ammunition to the armed opposition, disbursing increasingly generous amounts, those who have trained and continue to train yesterday's illiterate peasants in the art of killing and looting, do not want a peace settlement in Afghanistan.... Having signed the Geneva agreements with one hand, these forces are using the other to explode the accords which have been reached. It is no accident that the transfer of weapons for the extremists via Pakistan has now increased sharply.

These forces would like to continue to speculate on the lie of the "Soviet occupation" to undermine the Soviet Union's authority and to aggravate still further among our people the anguish for the destiny of the soldiers serving in Afghanistan and to make themselves out as the true champions of peace and justice.

All that is so. But surely that will not ease the grief of the relations of Private N. Sayenko, to whom it is explained that he has not returned home because of the duplicity of the government of a country which, disregarding world public opinion, occupied Grenada and is generously helping the "freedom fighters" in Afghanistan?

Surely that will not soothe the heart of the mother of Private N. Golubenko, who died in a hospital bed without waiting for her last letter, merely because Pakistan has given shelter to the "mujahidin?"

Surely the fate of our boys in Afghanistan did not depend only on those who are on the other side of the mountains or the ocean? And when we speak of their fulfilled duty we must not forget that we paid too high a price for it—the blood of the 13,310 dead, the 35,478 wounded, and the 311 who are missing? Those were our losses as of early May.

This grievous toll was recently made public and, to our great sorrow, is continuing to grow. It has now been established that in all, 313 men are missing. It is believed that approximately one-third have died. But even these tragic figures cannot measure the grief which has come to our cities and villages with the zinc coffins, with the boys who are crippled.

Our leadership has taken an important step and fulfilled the people's will—it has decided to return their sons to their home. And this is one of the first most tangible results of restructuring, of the party's course toward democratization, toward the search for new approaches to solving the most burning problems. The new approach in foreign policy, the signing of the treaty on the elimination of an entire class of missiles, would have been impossible without restructuring. The rapid withdrawal of Soviet military units from Afghanistan would also have been impossible. The stereotype of thinking would have pushed us to an escalation of forces on both sides and fear of appearing conquered would have prevented the ending of the bloodshed.

Some people are trying even now to declare that the march our troops have begun to their border is a defeat. At a Kabul news conference, Lieutenant General B.V. Gromov, commander of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan, was directly asked about this by many journalists. The 44-year-old commander replied with military precision and categoricalness:

"The Soviet troops are returning home, fulfilling the Geneva accords. This is not a retreat. We were not waging a war here. We never set ourselves that aim. We helped the Afghan people ensure conditions for a peaceful life. Over these years not a single military subunit of the Soviet troops retreated or surrendered its position. There were losses, but the rebels' casualties were incomparably greater. There were also mistakes. But there can be no question of defeat...."

In their reports on the conference, many Western journalists noted the precision and sincerity of the young general. And in particular his admission of errors. Yes, there were errors by military specialists and commanders which led to losses, including, and not only, losses "of personnel and equipment."

I remember how on my first visit to Afghanistan in December 1982 I was talking in Mazar-e Sharif with a young lieutenant—a platoon commander. With anguish, with tears, he described how the dushmans had burned Soviet tanks and armored vehicles, unwieldy and slow on the narrow, unreconnoitered mountain roads. They were a convenient target for the bandits' grenade throwers. How many boys were killed then because the commanders were not familiar with the tactics for combat operations under such conditions, relying on the renowned Russian "hoping for the best."

I did not give the lieutenant's name at the time because the Soviet press then did not mention the Soviet servicemen in Afghanistan. But I have still kept his story in an old notebook:

"Our subunit was stationed close to a mountain village. The peasants came to us once asking us to drag out two buffaloes drowning in a swamp. In gratitude they brought us fresh vegetables, fruit, and cakes. For those who had not eaten such food for a long time, being restricted for many months to a hateful compote made of dried fruit, the peasants' gift was worth a lot. Then we ate vegetables and fruit almost every day—they were brought to us by small children. And the soldiers began to visit the village. The boys from Central Asia, who knew the Dari language, were good interpreters. The peasants asked us about life in the USSR, did not believe that in our country all children study, that the land is worked with tractors. They asked us to sing Soviet songs....

"But one day our commander's vehicle was fired on from an irrigation ditch on the corner and he was slightly wounded. He ordered that 'the entire village be shaken apart' but that the bandits be found. Peasants whom we knew came and said that it was strangers who had wandered into the village who had fired. That they would find them themselves and bring them to the 'rafik shuravi' —the Soviet comrades—themselves in the morning. But the wounded commander did not repeal his order. We discovered the armed bandits ensconced behind a thick irrigation ditch. Crossfire began. It continued until midnight. The dushmans' shots stopped when the commander brought in the tanks and they opened fire. In the ensuing silence we carried out dead and wounded comrades...

"After that the peasants no longer came to us, the dirty barefoot children no longer pranced about near us. And we were no longer invited to talk or sing songs. We knew that all the village inhabitants had left for somewhere, that the village was empty. But almost every evening someone would open submachinegun fire on the Soviet vehicles traveling along the road by this half-destroyed village.

"Orders are not discussed, they are carried out. But when I looked later into the eyes of the soldiers to whom I had given instructions during that night-time battle, I saw that we felt the same thing: pain and shame. Pain for the dead. And shame for the lack of restraint, the thoughtlessness of the man who gave the order...."

This was the only such incident in the military life of the lieutenant and his platoon. Perhaps that is why he described it with such pain.

And we should not be proud of such victories. What our enemies try to present as our defeat should be considered a victory. Victory is the decision to return the Soviet soldiers home, the march which our military units have started to the motherland, which welcomes its sons with gratitude and with an understanding of all the complexity of the mortal risk and heavy martial labor which were their lot. Victory is the possibility for the Afghans to decide their fate for themselves on the basis of the policy of national conciliation. All this is a victory for real good, duty, and internationalism.

Rebel Military Activity in Afghanistan Reported

20 Dead in Kabul

LD1507121488 Moscow TASS in English 1117 GMT 15 Jul 88

[Text] Kabul July 15 TASS—TASS correspondent Oleg Kuzmin reports:

The Afghan capital was again rocketed today at 5:30 a.m. Over 20 rocket projectiles exploded in residential areas of the city. As a result of the new crime of extremists, 20 people were killed and 34 wounded. Many buildings, including a mosque, were damaged. On Thursday residents of inhabited localities in the provinces of Paktia, Paktika and Kunar also fell victims of the armed opposition. Heavy artillery shelled villages of Morura [placename as received], (Kunar), Rude-Ahmadzai [name as received] and suburbs of Gardeyz (Paktia) and Khayr Kut (Paktika). At least five people, including three children, died and many were wounded. Apart from dwellings, a mosque was destroyed in Kunar, as was a Muslim sacred place (a burial place of a saint) in Rude-Ahmadzai.

The population of several provinces, including Laghman, Paktika, Nangarhar and Jawzjan, held protest rallies against crimes committed by extremists. Their participants wrathfully denounced recent explosions and shellings of Kabul, Jalalabad and other cities. Protesters pointed out that mutineers tried to frustrate fulfilment of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan by escalating terror.

An exhibition of weapons seized from opposition detachments in the latest battles, opened in Jalalabad. It was visited by representatives of the clergy, tribes, as well as residents of the city and peasants from surrounding villages. The exhibition showed possibilities of the Afghan Armed Forces which administered recent defeats on the enemy in the districts of Sorkh Rud, Achin and the area of Chaparhar [name as received], Nangarhar Province.

Reports are pouring in from various Afghan areas about successful operations of the Afghan Army against irreconcilable opposition groups. A detachment led by a certain Lal Mohammed [name as received] was destroyed in Vardak Province. Over 20 extremists, including the chieftain, were killed. A group of three who planned to commit a series of terrorist acts, was captured near Qandahar. In Samangan two anti-government groups were liquidated with the help from the local population. Most of their members were killed.

The BAKHTAR Agency cited generalized data on the results of combat operations for a week. Some 100 mutineers were killed, great quantities of weapons, including rocket launchers, recoilless guns, mortars, granade-launchers, large-calibre machine-guns and antiaircraft missiles (among them three Stingers) were captured. Two caravans with weapons dispatched from Pakistan were intercepted. Several munitions depots were destroyed.

Pakistani Advisors Noted

PM1407155388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jul 88 First Edition p 5

[Special correspondent B. Kotov dispatch: "Flareup of Terrorism. Crimes of Afghan Extremists"]

[Text] Kabul, Jul—The military-political situation in Afghanistan has been characterized in recent days by a flareup of terrorist actions by the "intransigent" armed opposition. It is believed here that these coordinated actions were deliberately timed to coincide with the 5-8 July visit to Kabul by Diego Cordovez, the UN secretary general's special representative, who was touring the three countries in the region to discuss the question of progress in fulfilling the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan.

Here are some facts from these days. As already reported, a truck packed with explosives was detonated in the center of the Afghan capital on the night of 5-6 July, causing numerous casualties. And during the day of 6 July and the night of 6-7 July, densely populated districts of Kabul were subjected to massive shelling. Some 25 rockets were fired on the city. As a result of the shelling, 8 people died and 15 were injured. Approximately 20 apartment blocks and 2 mosques were destroyed.

Nikolas Dominik [name as published], correspondent for a West German news agency, who is here at the invitation of the Afghan authorities, received rocket shrapnel injuries of medium severity. He was given urgent medical aid in the Soviet military hospital.

During the day of 7 July a car was blown into the air in a central district of Kabul (close to the Soviet military hospital). One Afghan child was killed and another seriously injured.

Intensive shelling of the administrative center of Qandahar Province and of security posts of the Afghan Armed Forces in that province is currently continuing. There are dead and injured. In Paktia Province two people died and three were wounded as a result of the 6 July shelling of the village of Mali Kheyl near the city of Gardeyz. Five people were injured, including three children, in the village of Shaki-Kheyl.

Extremists have also activated combat operations in Vardak, Bamian, Kabul, Laghman, and a number of other provinces. In Samangan Province alone 29 people have been killed, including 7 women and 16 children.

Blinded by hatred for their own people, the "intransigents" of the so-called "Islamic Party of Afghanistan" resort to fanatical methods of struggle. Thus, according to information received in Kabul, during the last 10 days of June an armed group of this party operating in Lowgar Province used toxins against the peaceful inhabitants of the settlement of Zarghun Shahr in the Madaga [place-name as published] District. Some 40 people died as a result.

Pakistani "advisers" who were present photographed the bodies. A foul provocation had evidently been conceived: Detachment leaders M. Tur and M. Karim widely put about the rumor that the toxins had been used by... Soviet troops! However, surviving residents of the settlement and also armed groups of the "Islamic Revolution Movement," which feud with the "Islamic Party of Afghanistan" in that region, directly accused the grouping of M. Tur and M. Karim of the crime. As a result there was even an armed clash between them.

More and more reports of gross violations of the Geneva agreements by the Pakistani authorities are reaching Kabul. "Terror caravans" which deliver weapons and ammunition to armed formations of the Afghan opposition are continuing to infiltrate Afghan territory from Pakistan with the obvious connivance and assistance of Islamabad. A caravan of 200 pack animals arrived in the village of Sari-Bazar [place-name as published] (Konduz Province) 3 July. On the same day 150 pack animals delivered arms and ammunition for rebels of the "Islamic Union of Afghanistan" to the village of Tavsak-Chashma [name as published] in the same province. On 6 July more than 500 rockets were transferred from Pakistan to the Sorkh Rud District (Nangarhar Province). And a group of extremists armed with several Stinger antiaircraft missiles, "surface-to-surface" launchers, and other types of heavy weapons and small arms arrived in the village of Owrya Khel (Parvan Province). Reports are continuing to be received that armed rebel groupings are joining forces to capture Bagram airfield in Parvan Province.

At the same time, the Afghan press reports that subunits of the republic's Armed Forces are conducting successful combat operations against armed opposition formations. Under its new rubric "Enemies of Reconciliation: Crime and Punishment" the newspaper HAQIQAT-E ENQELAB-E SAWR reports such actions by the Armed Forces of the Republic of Afghanistan in Nangarhar, Lowgar, Konduz, Vardak, and Qandahar Provinces. The newspaper testifies that considerable losses of manpower and materiel have been inflicted on the enemy.

Foreign Aid to Rebels

OW1407184888 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 6 Jul 88

[Text] An Afghan Government agency said that foreign military advisers from more than 50 countries have entered three Afghan provinces bordering Pakistan since 21 May, according to our Kabul correspondent. Most of them are Arabs and Pakistanis. There are also Americans, West German and French citizens, and a Chinese.

The Afghan Government pointed out that the foreign advisors were directly involved in the sabotage and terrorist acts of the rebels, who aimed at attacking government troops outposts and creating terror and disturbance in residential areas.

Women's Group Appeals for Release of POW's

LD1207200088 Moscow TASS in English 1852 GMT 12 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS—The Soviet Women's Committee, sharing the anxiety of Soviet mothers over the lot of their sons missing in action while on the Soviet troops contingent in Afghanistan, has appealed to a large circle of national and international organizations and eminent stateswomen and women prominent in the public affairs of their countries to facilitate an early release of the Soviet POW's.

It sent cables to various woman's organizations in Pakistan and women prominent in Pakistani public affairs, urging them to influence their government and the leaders of the Afghan opposition to set the Soviet youths free and allow them to return home.

The committee called on women serving on U.S. Congress and on the parliaments of West Germany, Denmark, Sweden, India and a number of other countries to use their high status to secure the liberation of the Soviet MIA's and enable them to reunite with their families at home.

Calls for every kind of assistance with an early release of the Soviet troops in captivity were addressed also to such international organizations as the office of the U.N high commissioner for refugees, the league of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the women's International Democratic Federation, the International League of Women for Peace and Freedom and the Women of the Socialist International.

The Soviet Women's Committee expressed the hope that thanks to efforts by all people of good will the Soviet troops will be able to come home in the near future.

Ministry Aides on Gulf Air Safety Problems

PM1407155588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 5

[B. Ivanov account of interview with Honored USSR Pilot V.Ya. Potemkin, deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation Flight Services Main Administration, and V.G. Shelkovnikov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation Air Traffic Main Administration: "In the Wake of the Persian Gulf Tragedy: There Are No Guarantees of Flight Safety"; date and place of interview not given—boldface as published]

[Text] **It is 10 days since the tragedy which unfolded in the air above the Persian Gulf, when an Iranian passenger airliner was shot down by a missile launched from a U.S. warship.**

Many questions connected with this incident still remain unanswered. The stories of what happened that are being released by the United States are in many respects refuted by facts cited by the Iranian side. The International Civil Aviation Organization [ICAO] Council is due to meet in emergency session in Montreal 13 July to examine the circumstances surrounding the incident and it might cast light on the main question: What was the cause of the tragedy—a mistake committed by the airliner pilot or the U.S. Navy's actions. But even today the facts that have been made public enable experts to, as it were, take a probing look at what happened and recreate certain details of the situation which developed on that fateful day.

The IZVESTIYA editorial office approached Honored USSR Pilot Vladimir Yakovlevich Potemkin, deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation Flight Services Main Administration, and Valeriy Georgiyevich Shelkovnikov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation Air Traffic Main Administration.

I wish to express my opinion on the Airbus crew's actions, V.Ya. Potemkin said. Even on the basis of the reports that have appeared in the press, I as a specialist have no doubts that the airliner was following its flight path. I will cite just two facts in support of this. First, only 7 minutes had passed from the time the aircraft had taken off. The airliner was still gaining altitude. Any pilot knows that, in these conditions, the aircraft cannot deviate at all from its flight path. There is simply no time, you are taking off. Second, the A300 Airbus, one of the most modern aircraft in the world, is fitted with the latest electronic equipment and sophisticated navigation instruments. Such an aircraft fully plots its route on its radars and any deviations are immediately notified to the crew. Furthermore, the pilot was in constant contact with the air traffic control center in Bandar 'Abbas and, had he deviated from the flight path, the controller would have immediately warned him of this.

Generally speaking, I would like to say that the safety of civilian aircraft flights above the Persian Gulf is now in doubt, and the Americans are to blame for this. Given the prevailing situation, this is a far from safe place for passenger aircraft flights. There is a perfectly realistic threat that such a tragedy could recur. It is not surprising that our airmen—Aeroflot has up to seven flights a week in that part of the world—are seriously concerned with the situation....

In V.G. Shelkovnikov's opinion, before measures are taken against any aircraft, it is necessary and mandatory to try and identify it. It is for this purpose that the ICAO has developed a certain procedure which must be observed by every state belonging to this organization.

First of all, he said, it is necessary to bear in mind that, according to these rules, the crew of every civilian airliner notifies all air traffic control centers through whose territory it will fly of its flight plan by telex 30 minutes before takeoff. Therefore, all traffic controllers along the route are supplied in advance with the necessary information about the flight's purpose, the flight number, its route, the aircraft type, the coordinates of sectors where the aircraft will gain or lose altitude, and so on. There is no doubt that the Iranian Airbus pilot had obeyed these prescriptions. Otherwise the aircraft would simply have not been allowed to leave the airport.

The Persian Gulf area is currently chockablock with warships and aircraft belonging to the United States and some West European countries. It appears that, in these circumstances, the aircraft recognition system in the region is not functioning properly. The tragedy of Flight 655 showed that there is no coordination between civilian air traffic control centers on the one hand, and military centers, military units (ships) belonging to different states, and air defense forces on the other hand. There is a prime need to develop such a system because it ensures the safety of civil aviation flights.

An aircraft can also be identified with radar help. Prior to takeoff a pilot is obliged to key an appropriate code assigned to him by the air traffic controller in the automatic transponder that is fitted in every aircraft. While in flight the aircraft automatically transmits a signal to all air traffic control stations and the radar screen, next to the blip indicating the aircraft's location, displays its index containing flight number and altitude information. Therefore, this signal must have been read on the U.S. ship's radars.

In my view, V.G. Shelkovnikov went on, the tragedy is rooted in the situation which prevails in the region. The point is that the air traffic control system operated by Iran and the United Arab Emirates (let us take these two countries since they were linked by the flight route) has now been penetrated by a third party, the U.S. naval task force. Not only has it assumed the right to control the airspace but, at its own discretion, it interferes with the flight of civilian aircraft, issuing orders to pilots of passenger airliners. The result is that other disasters were just about avoided on two occasions during the last few months.

I believe that the ICAO must conduct an independent investigation of this incident and, since the situation in the Gulf remains explosive, it should even elaborate a system of practical and legal measures to ensure flight safety.

Gromyko Receives Iraq's Sa'dun Hammadi

PM1407134988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jul 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report on Gromyko meeting with Sa'dun Hammadi, member of the Revolutionary Command Council and chairman of the National Council of Iraq, under the heading "Kremlin Meeting"]

[Text] Andrey Gromyko, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received in the Kremlin on 13 July Sa'dun Hammadi, member of the Revolutionary Command Council and chairman of the National Council of Iraq.

Hammadi is heading an Iraqi delegation to a Soviet-Iraqi friendship festival. The delegation arrived in the USSR at the invitation of the Presidium of the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries.

The sides expressed satisfaction with the ongoing development of Soviet-Iraqi relations that have long-standing and good traditions. They reaffirmed the mutual readiness to further deepen fruitful cooperation between the USSR and Iraq in the interests of the peoples in the two countries.

Various aspects of the Iran-Iraq conflict were discussed in the conversation.

Hammadi reaffirmed Iraq's readiness for ending the war on the basis of Resolution 598 of the UN Security Council and came out in favor of applying corresponding sanctions to Iran, which has refused to comply with provisions of the resolution.

The Soviet side expressed sincere concern over the drawn-out war between the two neighboring nations and stressed the need for the earliest transition to peaceful means of settling all disputes between Iran and Iraq.

The USSR believes that the main elements of a settlement, which would be fair and honorable for both sides, were contained in Resolution 598, which remains the principal reference point for efforts to terminate the Iran-Iraq conflict.

The sides gave much attention to the tense situation in the Persian Gulf. The recent developments in that region, above all the tragic loss of the Iranian airliner which was shot down by an American naval vessel, reaffirmed that the presence of a large U.S. naval force in the region only leads to new incidents that are extremely dangerous to the cause of peace and stability and to a further deterioration of the situation.

Under these conditions, the need for the withdrawal of warships of the non-littoral states from the Gulf was becoming even more persistent.

The function of protecting international shipping in the Gulf, as the Soviet Union suggested, could be undertaken by a corresponding UN force.

Gromyko and Hammadi considered problems of a Middle East settlement. In the opinion of the two sides, a constructive path towards this settlement was opened by the Soviet proposal for convening an international Middle East conference under U.N. auspices with the participation of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and all sides concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organisation.

The Iraqi side cited a number of facts proving that the idea of having an international conference on the Middle East was gaining broad support in the Arab world.

This was evidenced, in particular, by the documents adopted at the recent all-Arab summit meetings in Amman and Algiers. One could say that the Arab world was coming closer to general Arab consent on the issue of the international conference.

In the opinion of Hammadi, a Palestinian uprising in the Israeli-occupied territories was a new positive factor in the development of the situation in the Near East.

It was becoming ever more obvious that the majority of the Palestinians backed the PLO as the only organisation representing the Arab people of Palestine.

The sides discussed problems of the present-day international situation on a global scale and expressed their unanimous opinion concerning the need to apply maximum effort to eliminate the nuclear threat and end the arms race altogether.

International security, Gromyko said, was linked above all to the renunciation of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union, as has been repeatedly stated to representatives of Arab states, was pursuing a policy of peace and pressing for the reduction of arms on a reciprocal basis and the destruction of nuclear weapons. [Moscow TASS in English at 1643 GMT on 13 July, in a report of the Gromyko-Hammadi meeting, renders the preceding sentence as: "The Soviet Union, as has been repeatedly stated to representatives of Arab states, was pursuing a policy of peace and pressing for the elimination of arms on a reciprocal basis and the destruction of nuclear weapons."] .

This was evidenced by such specific steps as the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and the current Geneva talks on reducing strategic offensive arms.

The 19th nationwide party conference reaffirmed the Soviet Union's peace policy. Its decisions on perfecting further the political structure of Soviet society, promoting socialist democracy, and broadening glasnost were organically linked with all Soviet actions in the international arena.

The goal of these actions was to set up a system of universal security and expand mutually beneficial cooperation with all countries.

Hammadi highly assessed the historic process of perestroyka currently under way in the Soviet Union.

Gromyko conveyed greetings and best wishes to Iraqi President Saddam Husayn from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the entire Soviet leadership.

The conversation was held in a warm, amicable atmosphere.

Present were V.V. Tereshkova, chairman of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries Presidium; Zuhayr Ibrahim Sultan, first secretary of the Al-'Anbar Province Ba'th party committee; Khalid 'Abd al-Halim, general director of the Bureau of People's Organizations at the Iraqi National Council, and Sa'd 'Abd al-Majid al-Faysal, Iraqi ambassador to the USSR.

Hammadi News Conference

JN1407172188 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1430 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow, 14 Jul (INA)—Iraqi National Assembly Speaker Sa'dun Hammadi said that his talks with the Soviet officials were detailed and were permeated by an atmosphere of understanding.

At a press conference he held here today, Hammadi stressed the need to boycott Iran due to its refusal to respond to the calls of the international community. He said that the issue of boycotting Iran, especially since it is the party that rejects the international resolutions, has topped his talks with the Soviet officials he met with, foremost of whom was Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman Andrey Gromyko.

Hammadi gave a detailed explanation of developments in and dimensions of the Iranian aggression against Iraq. He also reviewed Iraq's stands and peace initiatives. He stressed that despite the deterioration of the military situation in Iran and its bitter military defeats, Iraq still stresses the five principles of peace proposed by President Saddam Husayn.

The Iraqi National Assembly speaker shed light on the new Iranian crime of killing Iraqi POW's in the Mawat Basin. He said that this crime is a flagrant violation of international conventions regarding the treatment of POW's, and a serious challenge to the international community and humanitarian principles.

Hammadi touched on the new Iranian law calling for the need to continue the war against Iraq. He said that this law is of a serious nature and proves the Iranian regime's insistence on continuing its aggressive war against Iraq. He added that this once again exposes this regime's aggressive nature and expansionist ambitions.

Answering a question on the Iraqi forces' advancement deep into Iranian territory, he pointed out that this is a temporary situation necessitated by military needs. He emphasized that the Iraqi forces will withdraw immediately after carrying out the tasks to guarantee their strategic superiority.

Decisions of Algiers Arab Summit Reviewed

PM1407151988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jul 88 Second Edition p 4

[Candidate of Historical Sciences R. Turdiyev article: "Near East: Invitation to Peace"]

[Text] The question of how to solve the conflict situation in the Near East and how to find a solution to one of the most complex and chronic regional conflicts—the Arab-Israeli conflict—has lost none of its acuteness over the years. It was also at the center of attention at the recent extraordinary conference of the heads of Arab states and governments held in Algiers. This conference was convened to support the mass demonstrations by Palestinians who have risen up in the Israeli-occupied territories. The Algiers conference adopted decisions on political, moral, and material aid to the insurgents and the Palestinian resistance movement. But its main result was the elaboration of a common approach to the resolution of the Near East conflict and the demonstration of the desire for a peaceful settlement.

The "Arab summit in Algiers signaled the end of the cold war in the Near East," the British journalist Sh. Bkhatiya [name as published] wrote in Israel's JERUSALEM POST. There is an element of exaggeration in this assessment since Tel Aviv itself is still greatly aggressive toward the Arabs. However, one can say in all certainty that both the work of the conference and its decisions were characterized by a spirit of constructiveness and realism.

What is the peace platform put forward by the Arabs? The leaders meeting in Algiers unanimously (this time M. al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, was also involved) confirmed their adherence to the plan for a Near East settlement and the solution of the Palestinian problem elaborated in 1982 in Fes (Morocco). As is well known, this plan provides for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, notably from East Jerusalem, the creation of an independent Palestinian state, and guarantees of peace between all countries in the region, including the independent Palestinian state. These guarantees must be granted by the UN Security Council (here, of course, it is also a question of the security of the State of Israel, although the latter was not mentioned directly).

According to the Fes formula, the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip are transferred to interim UN control. The Algiers conference regards these steps as a transitional stage in the course of which it is the task of the appropriate UN missions to ensure the defense of human rights for the Palestinians and also "guarantee the implementation of the Palestinian people's inalienable national rights." It is the task of the United Nations to halt the Israeli practice of terrorizing and killing Palestinians on the occupied territories.

The transfer of Palestinian territories to UN control is viewed as a possible option in the phased resolution of the Palestinian problem. The Arabs quite reasonably assume that the transition measures must be coordinated with the final settlement. They must be a real step toward the cessation of the Israeli occupation and toward creating conditions for the Palestinian people, including the population of the occupied territories, to be able to decide their own destiny without any external pressure and interference. Thus, the Arab countries have once again confirmed their rejection of the Camp David plan for "resolving" the Palestinian problem by granting "autonomy" to the inhabitants of the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip.

Along with the elaboration of a peace plan, the Arab countries expressed a clear opinion apropos of the instrument of a settlement. This must be an international conference on the Near East. Those present at the Algiers conference not only supported the idea of convening such a conference but also called upon the international community to galvanize its actions, make them more effective, and step up its influence on the position of Israel, which "persists in its repudiation of peace." It is envisaged that all sides in the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the PLO, will be involved in the work of the forum on an equal basis together with the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. Thus, it is implied that the conference must in no way encroach upon any side or give it any advantages which may enable it to impose its will and its own decisions. Such a balanced approach to the work of the conference is, undoubtedly, obligatory for all its potential participants since the conference would be doomed to failure without consideration for one another's positions and without the sides' equality.

As for the specific form of the Palestinian representation at the conference, the Arabs hold several views on this question. Whereas the PLO leadership prefers Palestinian representatives to take part as an independent delegation, a number of Arab countries—including, for instance, Syria—think that the formation of a single Arab delegation would be the most acceptable option. There are also people among the Arabs who support the creation of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation. One thing is clear—the settlement process will not advance without the participation of the PLO. Equally clear is the fact that no one can decide for the Arabs the specific form in which the Palestinians will take part in the work of the conference. Due respect must be shown for their choice.

Arab leaders believe that the conference must be an effective and effectual forum—the aim in convening it is the establishment of a just and durable peace in the Near East rather than the attainment of any piecemeal or separate solutions.

Thus, at the Algiers meeting the Arab states made their substantial contribution to the quest for a settlement in the region. It is consonant with UN decisions, the Soviet Union's efforts, and the aspirations of the peoples. The Arabs' newly confirmed support for the idea of an international conference is an invitation to peace. A real change in this area is now totally dependent on Israel's answer.

Supreme Soviet Chairmen Receive Egyptian

LD1307212188 Moscow TASS in English 1147 GMT 13 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 13 TASS—The delegation of the People's Assembly of the Arab Republic of Egypt, headed by its chairman Rif'at al-Mahjub, had a meeting today with the Chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Yuriy Khristoradnov and the Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Avgust Voss, the chairmen and members of the standing commissions of the two chambers.

The delegation is on an official visit in the Soviet Union.

Yuriy Khristoradnov and Avgust Voss described in detail the role of the bodies of people's power of all levels in Soviet society's political life and the measures taken to perfect their activity and structure in the light of the decisions of the 19th all-union party conference.

In his turn Rif'at Mahjub spoke about the work of Egypt's People's Assembly and declared for stepping up the efforts of the representatives of the two countries' supreme legislative bodies in exerting a positive impact on promoting the entire complex of Soviet-Egyptian ties, first of all economic relations.

Rif'at Mahjub noted the shared positions of the USSR and the Arab Republic of Egypt in questions of disarmament and strengthening peace.

He spoke highly of the USSR's role in seeking a peaceful settlement of the Middle East crisis and said that in Egypt's opinion the Soviet Union had played and continued to play a leading role in attaining a just solution of the Palestinian problem.

The sides declared for the speediest ending of the Iran-Iraq war on the basis of the U.N. Security Council's Resolution 598.

In an atmosphere of an open and constructive exchange of views the sides had a lively discussion of ways of expanding parliamentary ties between the two countries and launching interaction by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the People's Assembly of the Arab Republic of Egypt in the international arena, including within the framework of the Interparliamentary Union. With due account for the already attained positive changes the members of Parliament see their principal purpose in consolidating and building up the potential of bilateral cooperation and filling it with concrete content. The necessary preconditions for this now exist, it was noted from both sides.

The Egyptian guests showed much interest in the work of the 19th all-union party conference, the course of the discussion at it and the documents adopted by it.

Detailed answers were given to all the questions put by the Eguptian side.

Taking part in the conversation that passed in a warm and well-wishing atmosphere were deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Tatyana Bokareva, Boris Kravtsov, Sergey Losev, Viktor Mishin, the USSR Ambassador in the ARE Gennadiy Zhuravlev, the ARE Ambassador in the USSR Salah al-Din Hasan Basyuni and other officials.

A luncheon was held in honour of the guests on behalf of the chairmen of the two chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Egyptian members of Parliament visited the Lenin Mausoleum and laid a wreath. They also laid a wreath to the tomb of the unknown soldier near the Kremlin wall.

Yesterday the delegation visited the USSR Exhibition of Economic Achievements.

Condolences Sent to Gandhi on Train Disaster

PM1407135988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jul 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Deep Condolences"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has sent Prime Minister R. Gandhi of India a telegram which says: "Accept deep condolences in connection with the railroad disaster in Kerala State which resulted in the loss of human life.

"We convey sincere sympathy to the families of the dead and injured."

East Europe

Further Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to Poland

More Remarks to Krakow People

LD1407162988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 13 Jul 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] After the meeting between Polish and Soviet young people in Krakow's Wawel Castle [12 July] there was a concert of folk songs and dances. [video shows performers, Gorbachevs in audience] The performers were rewarded by applause, and one of the audience, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, was presented with the Order of the Smile. This is how the esteemed jury—children—reward someone each year, people from various countries, for cordiality and a sense of humor. [video shows two little girls presenting Gorbachev with a blue-bound document and a bouquet of flowers. He kisses the girls on the cheeks and brandishes the bouquet]

The same day, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev saw the sights of the royal castle of Wawel, and signed the honored guests' book. [video shows Gorbachev and Raisa being shown round, and Gorbachev signing book]

After looking around the castle, on the road to the airport, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev made a stop at one of Krakow's historic buildings, where there was a military hospital during the war. Here there was yet another meeting with the citizens of the town. [video shows cars, part of building, Gorbachev and Raisa, crowd in street]

[Gorbachev] Thank you for waiting for us. [laughter] You must have to go to work tomorrow.

[Voice from crowd] No, it's a holiday, Mikhail Sergeyevich.

[Gorbachev] Well, thanks anyway, since you went to the trouble of waiting, thank you.

I am very pleased to be in Krakow. There have been many meetings here, with the citizens of Krakow, with the authorities in Krakow, with young people, both Polish and Soviet. We have seen your castle, we have looked around a little in the center of Krakow. What a splendid city it is! A very fine city! You look at Krakow and think: What a lot man can do! Surely we will be able to overcome what is now in our path. We will overcome it, we certainly will! Particularly if we are together. What do you think? Agreed? Agreed!

But I am pleased that you do not only say agreed so loudly, but in agreeing also say: Let us think it over. And indeed, we do have things to think about. But we have already thought over the past thoroughly, and today it seems we are on the right road, both in Poland and in the Soviet Union. It is a common road.

Of course, we all want tomorrow to be better. If only....[Gorbachev changes thought] Believe me, Comrade Jaruzelski and I want maybe even more. Just think how famous he and I would be if tomorrow everything turned out fine! But I think that the posts which we hold demand that we should be very truthful, and very responsible to you, both in words and deeds.

[Unidentified man in crowd, speaking in Polish with superimposed Russian translation] This includes a 19th century portrait of Kosciuszko. [video shows man handing a pack of photographs to the interpreter, who hands it to Gorbachev]

[Gorbachev] Thank you, thank you. Did they tell you that my father was treated in the hospital here? So I want to thank you Krakowians for....

[Same man in crowd interrupts, speaking in Polish with superimposed Russian translation] This photo strip includes a picture of that very building. Please have a look at it, Comrade Jaruzelski. It is a photo strip of old Krakow.

[Jaruzelski in Polish with superimposed Russian translation] Well, we'll have a look at it. Thank you very much.

[Gorbachev] Well, I wish you good achievements, good mood, and good health. Goodbye. [video shows Gorbachev and crowd]

Szczecin Visit Detailed

PM1507080388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jul 88 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Living, Building, Seeking Together. M.S. Gorbachev's Meetings on Polish Soil"]

[Text] Szczecin, 13 Jul—M.S. Gorbachev's meetings on Polish soil are continuing. The intinerary brought the CPSU Central Committee general secretary to the seaside city of Szczecin on day three of his visit.

People's Poland stretches from the foothills of the Tatras to the Baltic Sea. There is no city and no settlement in the land where people do not remember the historic mission for the liberation of Poland from the Hitlerite yoke, which cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of Soviet and Polish soldiers.

They also recall with gratitude the labor heroism of the Soviet specialists who worked with Polish construction workers in the postwar years resurrecting the Szczecin shipyards. The first postwar Polish ship was built here 40 years ago. On the eve of M.S. Gorbachev's arrival the workers at the A. Warski shipyard brought the number of ships built for the Soviet Union alone to a total of 203. Szczecin is the sister city of Leningrad. One of its districts, called "Friendship" -is essentially Leningrad district: Construction workers from the city on the Neva are building apartment blocks there, not far from the shores of the Baltic Sea, which links the two famous cities.

The fresh breath of the sea was discernible at Szczecin Airport, where the Soviet IL-62 airliner from Warsaw landed this morning.

M.S. Gorbachev and his wife were welcomed to Szczecin by W. Jaruzelski and his wife; S. Miskiewicz, first secretary of the Szczecin PZPR Voivodship Committee; S. Rogalski, chairman of the Szczecin Voivodship People's Council; Szczecin Voivoda S. Malec; members of the public; and working people of the city.

The motorcade made its way to the A. Warski shipyard. "We are in complete solidarity with our Soviet friends in their great cause of restructuring"; "Our future is in our own hands"—these were the placards with which the shipbuilders greeted the visitors.

The conversations that started up at the very gates of the shipyard were neither platitudinous nor formal. They were about ways to make cooperation more effective and to solve problems that have arisen of late. In short, the conversations were about how to live, build, and seek together.

It is very important that the meetings with working people should be permeated not only with warmth and cordiality but with sincere interest in one another's affairs.

Z. Pyda, secretary of the shipyard party committee, and J. Glub, shop chief, told M.S. Gorbachev about the collective's fulfillment of Soviet orders. R. Burzynski, a worker, joined in the conversation. We thought for a long time, he said, about what we ought to wish you, Comrade Gorbachev. As is known, any power is assessed not by its good intentions but by real deeds. Therefore, above all, we wish you consistency in implementing restructuring.

"And the strength to do it, Comrade Mikhail," another worker added, quoting the popular Polish song that had been warmly received at the concert in Krakow the day before.

M.S. Gorbachev: I also wish you success because if the working class is having success, the whole of society feels confident, in particular, the ruling party and the government.

"Our team loves to travel, but it has not managed to get to Moscow yet," another interlocutor, Foreman R. Czaplicki, said.

M.S. Gorbachev: Consider the matter settled. I think we will organize a visit for you. You will see the Kremlin and talk with our workers. The most significant thing is that relations between our countries have descended from intergovernment level, to the level of oblasts, labor collectives, families, and young people. This process must continue.

Addressing M.S. Gorbachev, R. Czaplicki also proposed organizing a "machine tool to machine tool" exchange between the Szczecin shipyard and, for example, the Riga shipyard.

"OK, we'll remember that; it's a good idea," the CPSU Central Committee general secretary agreed, and added:

"There must be more exchanges of opinion: at the level of scientists, specialists, and worker collectives. For all their differences, we in the USSR and Poland have much in common, in terms of the work of government bodies and the implementation of economic reform at enterprise level, especially as you have already acquired some good experience and given yourself some bruises. We have, just the same. And when we exchange experience, everything becomes much clearer.

"But our countries have great potential. And we have educated people and big traditions. The main thing is that both our peoples have great love for their countries. Patriotism is a massive force both in Poland and in the Soviet Union. This means that even now, it will help us to solve our tasks. What we have embarked on is not a simple matter. But we must do all we can to speed up our reform and solve the food, commodities, housing, and health questions without delay."

As one group said goodbye to the general secretary with firm worker handshakes and applause, another was already greeting him. A few steps further on in the shop, M.S. Gorbachev was already surrounded by people in blue overalls. They held out autograph books. Time was passing, the program was getting behind schedule, but no one was refused.

Worker M. Cichon asked the Soviet leader to talk about the visit, about relations between our countries.

Our cooperation is making progress, M.S. Gorbachev replied. Comrade Jaruzelski and I have been discussing today how our economic ties are to develop in 1991-1995. All in all, our relations at the moment are not simply expanding but are becoming more concrete. Young people, workers, scientists, and the intelligentsia in our countries are drawing closer to one another. And it is this that has delighted me during the meetings and conversations I have been having.

You must also bear in mind that the Soviet Union and Soviet people have the greatest comradely respect for People's Poland. Comrade Jaruzelski and I have complete mutual understanding and very good human contacts. But without the support of the working class and working people, nothing would happen. Our task at leadership level is to make politics essential and intelligible to people. If it is not accepted by the people, no one needs it.

The frankness and clarity of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's views on the common problems that are worrying our two peoples today particularly impress the Poles. In an interview for Polish television, Mikhail Sergeyvich was asked why he had a great liking for W. Jaruzelski.

You know, M.S. Gorbachev replied, at first we simply met as people who had to meet because their official positions required it. But now I can say that Comrade Jaruzelski and I have a great party friendship. The chief feature of it is the fact that we are fighting together, working together to lead our countries to new frontiers, in the interests of people, in the interests of socialism at large. I make no secret of the fact that we have very good relations. I regard Comrade Jaruzelski as a very good friend.

And I can tell all Poles honestly and plainly that you are lucky to have a man of high morals and vast potential, an internationalist, in the international arena at this difficult stage in Polish history—a man who loves this land, in short, a dedicated man.

The atmosphere was equally frank and businesslike at an A. Warski shipyard rally addressed by W. Jaruzelski and M.S. Gorbachev.

The Polish shipbuilders tumultuously applauded the Polish and USSR leaders' speeches. The shipbuilders warmly accepted the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's gift to the enterprise collective—a picture by Leningrad artist E. Vyrzhikovskiy entitled "Moscow."

Welder F. Olczak expressed heartfelt thanks to the guest for his warm words about the shipbuilders and all working people in Poland on the shipyard workers's behalf. He presented M.S. Gorbachev with a model of the maritime ferry "Georg Ots," which was built at the yard and served as the Soviet leader's residence during the historic Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik.

On receiving the gift, M.S. Gorbachev said that it had served as a fine home, and not only a home but also a study and a press conference room; it was, in short, a first-rate ship.

"Allow me to take your words," the worker said, turning to M.S. Gorbachev, "as an appreciation of the skill of the yard's engineers and workers. It is for us a symbol of the creative collaboration that exists between the peoples, and I would like to convey from the rostrum of this rally cordial wishes to Soviet people from the shipbuilders and all the working people of Szczecin."

En route from the shipyard to the center and before visiting the city's historical monuments, new meetings took place with the working people of Western Pomerania.

The passage of the motorcade through the streets of Szczecin and the general secretary's walk through the avenues of fountains leading to the Castle of the Pomeranian Dukes served to confirm, as it were, M.S. Gorbachev's words about the warm reception shown him in Poland. There was an authentic outburst of good feelings, smiles, a celebration of heartfelt openness. As we have already become accustomed to in recent days, the happiest prizewinners of this festival of friendship were the children and adults who possessed autographed copies of the book "Restructuring."

To understand the the Polish psyche, you have to remember that they began reviving their homeland from the ashes of war not by restoring plants and shipyards or even houses. The first thing they did was to bring back historical monuments from oblivion. One of them, the Castle of the Pomeranian Dukes in Szczecin, restored after the war and once the residence of the Polish Piast dynasty, now serves the people, having become a true focus of culture and esthetic education. The concert halls, theaters, and exhibition gallery are favorite places of leisure for the inhabitants of Szczecin.

M.S. Gorbachev listened with interest to an account of the castle's history and the present cultural mission of this architectural masterpiece. A luncheon in honor of M.S. Gorbachev and his wife was given in one of the castle halls by the local authorities.

Then it was on to the memorial consecrated to the exploits of Poles in Szczecin.... It seemed as if the whole of the city was in the square that day. The Soviet guest was welcomed by both young and old. Mikhail Sergeyevich was warmly greeted by Waclaw Bercewicz, veteran of the Belorussian front, and Artur Zurawski, member of the Union of Socialist Polish Youth. One had liberated the native lands; the other was building a new life on them.

M.S. Gorbachev was given a miniature of the memorial. It is composed of three eagles, symbolizing three generations of Poles: the fighters for Poland's historical right to the Western territories, the builders of new Western Pomerania, and those born here after the war who are creating the future of this ancient Polish land. On receiving the gift, M.S. Gorbachev conveyed greetings to the inhabitants of the city from Soviet people. "I am glad of the opportunity," he said, "to pay due tribute on this sacred spot to the courage and valor of those who made it possible for us today to proceed along the path of restructuring and renewal."

The general secretary laid flowers at the monument.

The next stop was at Szczecin's Central Cemetery.

M.S. Gorbachev and W. Jaruzelski approached the memorial to fraternity in arms. Around 4,000 Soviet and Polish soldiers who died fighting to liberate Szczecin and during the Berlin operation are laid in eternal rest here.

The Soviet and Polish leaders laid wreaths on the memorial. An honor guard formed up and the two countries' national anthems were played.

The general secretary approached veterans. The handshake lasted a little longer when Mikhail Sergeyevich faced Semen Shulyakovskiy, who had inaugurated his martial path under M.V. Frunze's leadership and traveled the front-line routes from Lenino to Berlin.

But the people assembled at the heroic servicemen's graves did not disperse for a long time yet. Let us talk to one of them and introduce ourselves. He is Kazimierz Wyszkowski, a participant in the fighting for Szczecin. The veteran was moved when he spoke of his meeting with M.S. Gorbachev. "When we war veterans met with M.S. Gorbachev," he said, "we were meeting not only a major statesman but also the son of one of our brothers in arms, Sergey Gorbachev. We learned for the first time yesterday from W. Jaruzelski's speech that Mikhail Sergeyevich's father was wounded on Polish soil and treated in a Krakow hospital. And yesterday," the veteran admitted, "I was even more excited when I saw on television Gorbachev Junior visiting the house at 37 Kosciuszka Street, where people still remember his father, an ordinary Soviet Army serviceman."

Cherishing the memory of servicemen and fallen heroes also forms part of the Polish psyche. No one is forgotten, it is said.

And life goes on....

As the motorcade headed for the Gumieniice state horticultural and truck farm combine, summer was in full flood. Harvesting was in full swing in the fields, orchards, greenhouses, and open plots of the combine. It was on the "shop floor," for that is what the Polish agrarian specialists call their production premises, that a conversation took place with M.S. Gorbachev on pressing problems and ways of developing agricultural production.

Addressing those assembled, M.S. Gorbachev said: "I greet through you those people who feed the entire people living in our world. I know that peasants and rural inhabitants in Poland know how to work and that they are right now bringing in fine harvests. producing a lot of livestock output, and mastering new techniques.

"I know that the peasants energetically support the political course of the PZPR and government. That is very important, comrades. Here, in the Szczecin region, an ancient Polish territory, we had a marvelous meeting with the shipyard workers, which also shows that the working class is in favor of the policy of socialist renewal. And if we combine the impressions, what we have here is the support of the working class and peasantry for the policy proposed to people's Poland today by the PZPR. I think that if there is a desire and support for this policy from the working class and peasantry, that means that the policy is a people's policy, that it is directed at people, and that means that the policy will be successful. But that does not mean that it is manna from heaven. The policy is a call to work. These are goals requiring sustained labor. May you not grow weary en route."

Before his departure for Warsaw Mikhail Gorbachev was the guest of the owner of a small peasant farm.

M.S. Gorbachev was accompanied during his trip through the Szczecin area by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; and V.I. Brovikov, USSR ambassador to Poland; and, on the Polish side, J. Czyrek, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee; B. Kolodziejczak, member of the PZPR Central Committee Secretariat; E. Kucza, chief of the PZPR Central Committee International Department; T. Olechowski, Polish foreign minister; W. Natorf, Polish ambassador to the USSR; and other officials.

Warsaw Speech to Intellectuals

PM1507133988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 2, 3

[TASS report: "The Intellectual Charge of Restructuring. M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With Cultural Figures and Scientists From the Polish People's Republic and the USSR"]

[Text] Warsaw, 14 Jul—A meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and cultural figures and scientists from the Polish People's Republic was held in the Polish capital's Royal Castle today.

The meeting was opened by B. Suchodolski, one of Poland's most venerable scientists and a major public figure in the country. Meetings in the Royal Palace, he said, are traditional. Many Soviet people have taken part in them. But this meeting is totally exceptional, and all of us who are present in this hall must bear this in mind. What makes it exceptional is the fact that we are welcoming here a man who is more than just someone who can competently brief us on everything that is happening in the Soviet Union. We are welcoming today the man who is creating the Soviet people's future, the Soviet state's future, and is thus a co-author of the creation of the whole world's future.

This view is especially close to the hearts of the Polish intelligentsia, and of the Polish creative intelligentsia in particular. We are glad that this path into the future has so many elements in common and can today become our joint open path. I would like to emphasize this because until now—over a lengthy period of time, over several decades, over a period that bears Stalin's imprint, over the period of post-Stalin stagnation—our minds developed complex and contradictory ideas.

We members of the Polish intelligentsia fittingly appreciated the world significance of the October Revolution. We appreciated the Soviet people's tremendous contribution to the struggle against fascism. It was the army that came from the East that brought us our freedom and, as was correctly said in the Sejm, guaranteed our physical existence. I also recall the frosty morning in January when I was able to come out of the dungeon where I had been thrown by Hitler's Gestapo machine. And we all realize how important it is to keep alive the gratitude and indebtedness to the Red Army. At the same time, however, we had so many doubts and so many inner conflicts. We thought and spoke about what was happening to millions of Soviet people, and when we learned the fate that had befallen cultural figures and the restrictions imposed on science's potential, we asked ourselves questions that overflowed with anxiety, emotion, and fears: Does socialism really demand such sacrifices, is it really necessary to pay such a price for its existence?

Now we are on a clear path leading into the future. I think that if we look at the activity of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee from this viewpoint, we can perceive many very important periods in our community. This applies primarily to the new concept of thinking and to the new concept of Europe as our common home.

The concept of the new thinking was conceived in the process of analyzing international relations and the struggle for peace and the prevention of the threat of a world war. This is so. But this concept has broader potential and horizons. We need new thinking in all spheres of contemporary civilization. This civilization is now living through a dramatic period of conflicts between the grandeur of human creativity which is meant to bring happiness and satisfaction to man, and the specific reality which is often used to people's detriment and thus leads to unrest, defeats, and threats. Never before have science and technology been so highly valued and so necessary. At the same time, however, they have never before posed such a threat, a threat of universal destruction. We people working in culture and members of the Polish intelligentsia now face a new major question: How to place the achievements of civilization at the service of society and how to manage them? How to manage contemporary civilization so as to protect mankind from its dangers? And this problem is exceptionally acute for us at present. We can see this problem not only in the shape of the broad peace movement but also in the broad movement for environmental protection which presents us with new tasks and indicates man's new situation in the kingdom of nature. Our efforts must be concentrated around humanitarian ideas, including the renewal of socialism. We must concentrate on the new thinking which guards humanitarian values.

A second element which seems especially important to me concerns Europe as our common home. We people working in culture are especially sensitive to questions concerning Europe's problems. Primarily because culture is now really becoming Europe's common voice.

Europe is divided at present. There are two Europes. It is divided politically, economically, and militarily. But at the same time Europe is culturally united. There is no sense—and we will struggle against this—in dividing European culture into Eastern and Western. There is no such thing as the Western music of Mozart and Beethoven and the Eastern music of Russia. There is just one single European music. There is no such thing as the Western poetry of Byron and the Eastern poetry of Pushkin and Mickiewicz. There is just one poetry which wins all Europeans' hearts. We must realize that culture remains a single whole precisely despite this kind of division. Despite all its European national diversity, it is an individual force which gives us inspiration.

This new thinking, the scientist went on, will enable us to build the European home better than before. We are convinced that this is a task of culture, art, and science. I would like to remind you of these European values so that we can all think and reflect precisely in this direction. Our relations with the Soviet Culture Foundation, as planned earlier, must encompass European problems in the context of our common home. I think that this will be a valuable contribution to the struggle for peace and new conditions of human existence. This is all I would like to say by way of an introduction.

Now I want to say that we will listen with great attention to what the general secretary will tell us. We have gathered here largely because we are interested in what is really happening in the Soviet Union. But I think that most people have come here driven not by this interest but by the desire to participate in the work on improving our society.

B. Suchodolski then gave the floor to M.S. Gorbachev.

M.S. Gorbachev's Speech [subhead]

I would like to begin by expressing gratitude to those who have come here with me and to the representatives of Soviet science, culture, and art who are also here today. We are sincerely pleased to have this meeting. I am not saying this to please you. I only want to voice one very important thought. It took hold of us after the so-called "Issyk-Kul Forum" held on the initiative of the writer Chingiz Aytmatov, who is present here.

At that time we drew the unanimous conclusion: The world is at a crucial stage. And this applies to the whole world, to all countries and all parts of the world. If anyone tries to pretend that today's changes are no concern of his, this is dishonest and does not correspond with reality.

Our entire civilization is going through a very responsible stage in its development. It can be said that its structure, this entire most complex structure encompassing both the material and the spiritual spheres of contemporary civilization, is undergoing a real test at this time. I have in mind the imperatives connected with the real threat of nuclear destruction. I have in mind the interlinkage between different parts of the world which makes it incumbent on all to show greater responsibility. I have in mind the ecological threat and other global problems.

And so, having perceived the special nature of this crucial stage in the history of human civilization, the scientists and writers who took part in the "Issyk-Kul Forum" were unanimous when speaking of the new link between politics and culture in our time. Of course, states exist and politics also exists. Politics implements in one way or another, correctly or incorrectly, various interests which are multifaceted and very serious. Generally speaking, politics exists—domestic politics and international politics alike—and this cannot be ignored.

Nowadays, at this crucial stage of human history, unless politics is enriched by scientific knowledge and nurtured on morality—and this presupposes mandatory participation by nations' and peoples' intellectual forces—it is doomed to really grave vacillations and errors. Nothing costs as much, and the peoples do not pay as high a price for anything else as for political errors. We all, in Poland and in the Soviet Union alike, could find numerous facts to confirm this.

This is why I, and probably Comrade Jaruzelski and anyone else who has been entrusted with a lot and who carries major responsibility on his shoulders, feel this way. We do not try to evade responsibility, but we also feel all its weight.

This meeting right here, in the presence of Comrade Jaruzelski, is also remarkable due to the fact that it inaugurates, as it were, this beautiful hall in a restored palace which is a sacred site in Polish history.

It is here that we are talking about the present, about our countries, about what we are doing in our own countries, about the way we look at the past and the lessons we are learning from it so as to arm ourselves for the transformation of the present for the sake of the future which is our goal.

This is what I would like to say now. The major part of our visit to Poland is over, and at this meeting with its intelligentsia, representatives of the people's spirit and spokesmen of the nation's spirit, I would like to say: We have been tremendously impressed by what is happening in modern Poland. It is again seeking and, it seems to me, finding an answer to the question: What path should be followed by this large European state, with its great culture, complex history, and complex present?

Why is this path being sought? Yesterday, on our way back from Szczecin, we had a meeting with peasants and a woman expressed it very simply, as is generally done by ordinary people on whom, as a matter of fact, any state or society is based. The conversation was about the purpose of what we are doing in our country in the Soviet Union. We want, I told her, to make sure that in a socialist society all people, and primarily the working people—because socialism is the working people's system, the people's system—live well and feel happy. You know, my interlocutors' reaction was such that I had no need to look for arguments, they were superfluous.

The most important thing is for people in Soviet society and in socialist Poland to feel good. That is the reason for the most important turnaround which we are both effecting through restructuring in the Soviet Union and through socialist renewal in Poland. We are disclosing the innate, profound meaning invested in the socialist system, in its very essence and are reorienting it in the direction of man. The human dimension, the human criterion must be the main criterion for judging the achievements of socialism and, conversely, its losses. We are embarking on the humanization of society through restructuring and renewal. A man who feels good is capable of great things.

For many decades our peoples have proved their love of their country. We take pride in this. The patriotism of the Russian people and of the Soviet peoples and the patriotism of the Polish people are tremendously independent significant entities. The combination of this love and our peoples' devotion to their fatherland with the new opportunities which we are now opening up in order to reveal national spirit and peoples' aspirations can ensure great breakthroughs both in the spiritual and the material spheres and in science and culture—in all areas.

So, strictly speaking, what can I say in response to the question of what we want now that we have embarked on the path of restructuring? It seems so simple! However—and this is natural—we would all like our plans to be carried out more rapidly. Yes, perhaps the people who are today invested with the responsibility and whom the peoples have put in power want this most of all. It is natural for any politician to wish his activity to be linked with successes and to wish to go down in history mounted on a white charger....

But we must be realists: We are talking about tremendous and most profound changes and the implementation of a policy which both your people and our people—the peoples who have prepared restructuring and renewal—have achieved through suffering. You and us, especially those of you here who represent the intelligentsia of the Soviet Union and Poland, are well aware of how difficult it was to draw up precisely those plans for the immediate and the far-distant future for our peoples and for our states.

At the same time we must be not only revolutionary and resolute in implementing our thoughts and plans. We must stick to reality and not succumb to illusions. That would be most dangerous. Once again I want to reiterate that we know this from our own experience. That is why we are studying our past so attentively and peering into it with such merciless criticism and truth. It is not easy. It requires courage. Sometimes what we learn causes you to seem to have been knocked sideways. Yet we do not emerge weakened from this mercilessly truthful analysis—there is but one truth and if we are referring to the past, the truth has already emerged as it was. We note (I am referring in this case to both the Soviet Union and to Poland) great historical achievements, despite the fact that they were accompanied by tragic events which also had a great effect on the whole process of socialist building, on the fate of the peoples, on the fate of specific people, and on the intelligentsia. In short, this is instructive work.

Maybe this is precisely a case where the lessons of the past give us more strength, wisdom, courage, more patience, and more tolerance. They arm us with new knowledge and, I must say, this fortifies the spirit. A weak-spirited man would not resolve the tasks that we have set ourselves today. The restoration to moral health of people's society is under way. We will not manage these tasks without moral health. Strictly speaking, restructuring began when we decided to investigate what kind of home we live in, what has happened to it, how its foundations, the walls, and everyone in it looked, and what was needed—cosmetic or capital repair. It was clear that cosmetic repair was not enough. The house needed thorough restructuring. Moreover, restructuring of all its parts—material, spiritual, and moral alike—and of science and culture.

That is how we embarked on restructuring, although there were also economic requirements. Of course, they also spurred us on to restructuring. But it was as a result of great spiritual and intellectual work that we acquired an essential understanding of its aims. In this connection I must tell you that relations were never so close and mutual understanding so deep between the leadership of the country and our intelligentsia as they are now. This is based not on honeyed speeches to one another. No, this is a closeness born of trust, a closeness which arose from acknowledging the goals and tasks which we are all setting ourselves. This comes from realizing that the country's politicians and cultural forces cannot fail to unite in the interests of the nations and peoples. I think that this has helped us to choose a path which on the whole and for the most part also coincides with your path of socialist renewal.

But you know that glasnost and openness were needed. One of the lessons of the past is precisely this: It turns out that other very serious attempts which sprang from the joint concerns of politicians and intelligentsia were also initiated and undertaken on several occasions. But it happened that the programs that had been devised suddenly died. It seemed that there was a sudden spark but no flame and things never went as far as a conflagration, admittedly, a conflagration in the good sense...not so that everything got burned up. Anyway, we have had enough conflagrations—both in your history and ours and in our joint history.

Why did nothing happen? Because we devised the plans and tried to implement them without broad participation not only from intellectual forces in society but also—and this is particularly important—without the participation of the masses for whom all this was apparently being organized. There was the belief that one circle of people expressed the interests of the people and knew better than the people themselves what they, the people, needed.

When beginning restructuring it was necessary to put everything in its place. The center of all action and plans was man and our responsibility to him and to the peoples, especially to such peoples as yours and ours, which deserve to be taken into consideration by virtue of their destiny and their historic acts and actions. They have indeed deserved that their life should change and become understandable to them themselves and accord with their vital interests.

So we have embarked on glasnost and have come to realize the particular value of democracy. I must be blunt and say that this was, perhaps, the most important discovery. It is startling that this discovery is being made by Communists, who began their entire struggle in order to eliminate exploitation and all injustices based on private property and in order to destroy and eliminate man's estrangement from the land, from the means of production, from spiritual values, and from political processes. For it is this that motivates all revolutionaries and this was the reason for the October Revolution. The party followed Lenin in order to resolve these tasks. But it turned out that it is only now that we have come to realize that we must once again return to Lenin's approach, which means fully bringing man back into socialist society and into material production, making him master there, and making him the main figure in the political process, just as in the spiritual sphere. In all respects he must sense that this is his country, which needs society to be in good moral health.

This is the case, however hard it may be to admit. We have firmly embarked on a new path in resolute mood, and society is in the same fundamental mood. Although there are also other sentiments—let us not embellish the situation. Struggle is under way, struggle in the form of debates, political dialogue, and comparison of stances. Shots are not ringing out but there is serious struggle, struggle through socialist pluralism of opinions. It is typical of our life today, which is still full of cares and worries.

At the 19th party conference we received a new injection of confidence and further proof of the people's support for our restructuring. This was an unprecedented conference, an unprecedented event. Virtually no one now living in the Soviet Union could recall such a discussion—either on the eve of the conference or at the conference itself.

We sensed for the first time how much had been building up in our people, and we sensed that they are ready and deem it necessary to talk about this to one another, to the government, and to the whole world. Events connected with the conference still need thought and reflection. But the main thing is now clear to us: The people are in favor of restructuring. Moreover, they are resolutely in favor of it. The most resolute speeches in support of restructuring—with a good healthy supply of criticism apropos the Central Committee, the government, and republic authorities—came from the representatives of the working class and the peasantry. Many felt uncomfortable and could see that we are lagging behind peoples' sentiments and wishes. We must act more resolutely. That is the conference's main conclusion.

We are now concerned to transform the conference discussions into actions and real practice. That is why we adopted a brief resolution at the conference itself saying that we must not wait for a congress or for constitutional changes—all this will happen—but let's come to an agreement now: The things that were elaborated at the conference must be the foundation of actions by the Central Committee, the government, and everyone—right down to work positions. Without delaying, we scheduled a Central Committee plenum centered on the problems raised by the conference.

During these days on Polish soil we have felt that similar concerns worry you too. I can say to you now with greater confidence that we are advancing along the same road while taking account, of course, of our own specific features. That is only natural and understandable; ignoring our specific features would be a great error. In my opinion, the dispute as to what the model of socialism should be is finally over. Scientific socialism exists, it is applied in the specific conditions of each country in the light of its traditions, level of development, political culture, potential, and so forth. That is my view on the "model" problem.

While acting independently and advancing along the path we have chosen by ourselves we are aware at the same time today how we two socialist countries need each other, need each other very much, more, perhaps, than ever before. And in conversations with Comrade W. Jaruzelski and other representatives of Poland and in meetings with people we are discovering many interesting and useful things for ourselves now when we are tackling new tasks and those we will be tackling in the wake of conference. I hope that our experience can be of some use to you and will at least serve to stimulate reflection and comparisons; that is very important.

In the second part of my speech I want to say the following. Perhaps it is precisely now that the enormous potential for building new relations between our peoples are being revealed. I know the mood of Soviet people, and during these days I have sensed the mood of Poles—to meet each other half way with open hearts. I will simply say to you that my comrades and I did not expect the kind of interest in us that we have met here. An interest, moreover, that comes from the heart. You can take someone out into the street, ask him to go somewhere or say something and he will go or say something while respecting his leadership and traditions, showing hospitality, and so forth. But you cannot change someone's face, eyes, and feelings, which are permanent features and which you see when in close contact. Through this contact we sensed a very great emotional elan, and this is perhaps the most important thing that is now beginning to distinguish our relations. Previously there were relations at the level of the parties, governments, republics, and various organizations. Now our peoples are moving toward each other. Let us look at the stance that has characterized both the Russian and Polish intelligentsia. They have always been distinguished by a great attachment to their own people, a devotion to them, and a readiness to serve them. If both our peoples possess such a desire, it is our task—both in politics and the spiritual sphere—to promote it. I think that it is also important because we are dealing with two socialist states, two neighboring states—states and countries which have shared a common fate for centuries, and we cannot conceive ourselves in the future as living other than in friendship and fraternity with the Polish people. And we want to tackle the tasks created by the times together with you.

I issue an invitation to you, dear friends, representatives of the Polish intelligentsia, and to our comrades, too, and through them the Soviet intelligentsia to do everything in their power, everything, and they must do it conscientiously, to ensure that their peoples achieve the great, humane goals set by the policy of restructuring in the Soviet Union and the policy of renewal in socialist Poland. I am certain and am prepared, paraphrasing Comrade Jaruzelski's words, to repeat what I said at the meeting with young people: The boat must not be missed. And, of course, it is impossible for the intelligentsia not to be on the boat of restucturing and renewal. And the loss from this would be greater rather than smaller because how young people will act and the stance they adopt will depend in many respects on your words and deeds.

A time of very great deeds, crucial deeds, lofty deeds, has arrived in our common history. I am not afraid to switch to a high-flown style, for we are indeed talking about a fateful time. Thank you. (Applause)

The following well-known representatives of Polish and Soviet culture and science spoke at the meeting: J. Rychlewski, chairman of the Polish Academy of Sciences Space Research Committee; R. Wojna, journalist and Sejm deputy; Ch. Aytmatov, writer; Professor M. Krapiec of Lublin Catholic University; Professor J. Szczepanski; Z. Safjan, writer; K. Zanussi, movie director; S. Fedorov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; M. Krol, journalist; Professor J. Adamski; Professor M. Nalecz; W. Zukrowski, chairman of the Union of Polish Writers; S. Zalygin, chief editor of the journal NOVYY MIR; Professor of Philosophy J. Kuczynski; K. Toeplitz, journalist; and A. Sandauer and J. Przymanowski, writers.

Summing up the discussion, Professor B. Suchodolski noted with regret that not everyone who wanted to speak had been able to. But there was a solution, the academic said, because we intend to publish a book on our meeting. All the speeches just heard as well as those that we were unable to hear will be included. We will also publish M.S. Gorbachev's answers to questions asked during discussion. If the CPSU Central Committee general secretary agrees with this suggestion, that is what we will do.

I am ready to support that suggestion, M.S. Gorbachev said. We did indeed find that time was lacking at this meeting. I greatly value this meeting. It is a pity that my itinerary does not allow us to continue our discussion. Everything said here has been extremely interesting. We have heard various ideas and opinions in this hall. Even quite recently when we spoke about unorthodoxy in our country, the question would immediately arise: Isn't it time to put an end to it? And yet unorthodoxy simply means different ideas. And different ideas should always be present during discussion of great problems, large questions, serious questions, new questions, since discussion, research into phenomena, and their assessment are always associated with the expression of different opinions, with thought processes, that is to say, different ideas will always be present there. Unorthodoxy, if it means different ideas rather than political exploitation (which also exists) is the powerhouse of spiritual, scientific, and technical progress.

It was very important to me to hear the interesting exchange of opinions and the statements and views of the participants, who spoke about everything that concerns them, you and us, and not only us. They spoke about this sincerely and with great enthusiasm.

Allow me to respond to just a few ideas expressed here.

First, the fear expressed here that the boat of restructuring carries just the intelligentsia and that there will be no others on it.

Of course, the invitation to the intelligentsia to board the boat of restructuring is a metaphor. It is the duty of the intelligentsia of every people to take part in their country's affairs when its fate is being decided. The significance of the intelligentsia's service to the people grows immeasurably during a crucial time. But this in no way means that workers, peasants, and the working people will not be on board the boat of restructuring. No, the working people are the main active participants in restructuring.

The labor of politicians and representatives of the intelligentsia is very important. Fused with the labor of workers and peasants, it makes it possible to achieve a great deal. That is where the task lies.

I am confident that our working people and the working class already occupy their places on the boat of restructuring.

And another thing. Sometimes we are reproached—and this reproach has been made here—that we in the Soviet Union have done a lot of talking. Whereas it is necessary to do more, to work. Of course, there are those who love to substitute talk for action. But we will retain glasnost and discussion. Otherwise neither the potential of the system nor the intellectual potential of our country can be revealed. We insist on this and will go on insisting on this even if it does displease some. That is only natural, there is nothing special here.

Many speeches very fittingly and powerfully expressed the idea that it is essential to move more confidently and rapidly toward understanding our common history to equip our nations with historical knowledge. I would not want to go into the specifics of this problem now. There have already been several conversations with Comrade Jaruzelski on this score and there are comrades here who are now discussing together with their Polish comrades how to make this work broader and more systematic in character and produce new works and assessments, including the use of literature and new sources which are becoming available to qualified specialists in Poland and the Soviet Union. I think we are on the right track. But I also feel that there is not yet satisfaction with what has been done, and there is a desire to advance more quickly. I welcome and note this.

Unfortunately, I have no more time to answer many interesting and major questions.

Professor Suchodolski has suggested the publication of all the speeches in the form of a book, which would also print those speeches prepared for our meeting but not actually delivered. I could also answer in writing those questions that were put to me here.

In my opinion, this is an interesting suggestion, and it will perhaps be precisely the book that we need to stimulate our joint efforts in the intellectual field and on the path of cooperation.

I thank you for this meeting. I can see it was necessary for us and for you and note that it is ending in a spirit of increased mutual understanding and respect. (Applause)

Polish Version of Castle Speech

LD1407104188 Warsaw Televison Service in Polish 0840 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Speech by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at meeting with cultural representatives in Warsaw Castle—live; in Russian with superimposed Polish translation]

[Text] Our agenda, the agenda of the visit, has led us to this meeting, and I would like to voice my satisfaction with the fact that I see here representatives of our science, culture, and art who have found themselves here at the same time. I think that they will join us in our rejoicing at this meeting. We are sincerely pleased. I say this not because I want to please you, the representatives of Polish culture, but I would just like to state one very important thought that has already become dominant. I see the writer Chingiz Aytmatov. He will help me recall that when he invited himself to a meeting of numerous representatives of figures of world culture—the so-called forum of world culture—I conversed with those taking part in that forum.

We all came to one conclusion: The world finds itself at a watershed stage of its development. This pertains not merely to our countries; it pertains to the whole world. If someone imagined something different—that this watershed stage has nothing to do with him—it would be dishonest of him, since this would fail to correspond to reality. Our entire civilization is currently going through a crucial stage of its development. It can be said that the construction, the whole, extraordinarily complex construction that encompasses our present civilization's material and spiritual spheres alike, is indeed being put to the test of time. I am thinking here of the imperatives connected with the nuclear threat, the threat of annihilation of our civilization. I am thinking of these ties, which we now have in every part of the world, and this requires greater responsibility of everyone. I am thinking of the ecological threat and other global problems.

Then I noted that we were at a special stage in the development of civilization. The scientists and the writers shared my view, and we said that today you cannot escape politics: If there is a state, there is politics. Policies are implemented in various ways, right or wrong, but, all in all, politics exists. We can never get away from the fact. There is state politics, there is the politics of international relations. If today, at this crucial stage in the development of our history, politics is not enriched by scientific and moral knowledge—and for this we require the participation of all people's intellectual forces—then politics will be condemned to very serious vacillations and error. Nothing is an expensive and people do not pay as much for anything as political errors.

We find many facts in both Poland and the USSR that bear out what I said. In connection with this, I think—and Comrade Jeruzelski feels the same—people who have been entrusted with a great deal, a great responsibility rests with them and we are aware of this and we do not shirk this responsibility. I think that Comrade Jaruzelski and I are taking part in this meeting because the very fact of this meeting and the fact that you have come with us to this hall—and I was told, you know, that this hall was opened recently, Professor Geysztor told me this—and that we are opening this hall with this meeting, and this is magnificent. The fact that we are here together with you, we can reflect on our times, how we live in our countries, what we do, how we regard the future, and what conclusions we draw from this, so as to be armed for the future. This is what my approach to this meeting is, and I would like, on my own behalf, on behalf of the delegation, and on behalf of Raisa Maksimovna, to greet you cordially, to greet Professor Suchodolski, who is in charge of this meeting, and all of you, the participants in the meeting. [applause]

It is very difficult, because I know we have little time and I would like to say a great deal. Will this succeed? I do not know. But what will be, will be. What I say will be sincere. This is what I would like to say, above all. The main part of the visit to Poland is behind us. At this meeting with the Polish intelligentsia, with those who represent the national spirit, who express the national spirit, the national interests, I would like to say that what is currently taking place in Poland impresses us greatly.

Poland is again searching, and I think it is finding an answer to the question of how the people are to proceed. It is a large European state, a state of great culture and history, complicated history, and a country that has quite a complex present situation. I think that last night, when we met farmers—it was in Szczecin voivodship—in a straightforward manner, as happens with the ordinary people who are the very salt of the earth of our countries, the following simple conversation produced the following reaction: When I was asked to describe in brief what we were doing in the Soviet Union and what objectives (?we were setting ourselves), I replied simply that we want all people, and especially the working people, to have a good life and to feel good in our socialist society, inasmuch as it is a system for the working people. This received such a reaction that I, prepared to supply further arguments, saw that this was unnecessary. That is the most important thing, that equally in Soviet society and socialist Poland people should feel good.

This, I think, is the greatest change we are accomplishing through restructuring and socialist renewal. We open up the deepest sense of this system, this social system, its essence; we are turning it around so that it is more receptive to the needs of mankind. It is the human dimension that ought to represent the main criterion of what has been accomplished. It so happens that through restructuring, through renewal, we move forward toward humanizing our society. This is the most important thing, since all this carries over into all other areas of life. A person who feels good is capable of many things. Our people, who for many centuries have shown their love for their soil, of which we are proud, since the patriotism of the Russian people, the nations of the Soviet Union, and the Polish nation, are a valuable asset in themselves, of enormous significance. The combination of this love, these links of our people with the fatherland, with what we are opening up through the new possibilities, the manifestations of the national spirit, and people's aspirations can safeguard a great progress for us in the material, spiritual, and scientific spheres.

Well, if one is to speak of this and say what we have wanted since we began marching along the path of restructuring; then this is precisely what we want. It would seem that everything is simple. We all want this to be accomplished as speedily as possible. Maybe those upon whom the responsibility rests at present, the responsibility toward the people, the responsibility of the authorities—you all have the common desire that this should take place as soon as possible. It would seem that this is the greatest desire of each politician—that his intentions come to fruition, that he enters history as the one who was the executive in charge.

But we have to be realistic, since we are talking about the deepest, widest transformations. We are talking about [word indistinct] policies for which our people have suffered. After all, we know how we reached restructuring and renewal. Above all those who rperesent the intelligentsia of the Soviet Union and Poland know full well how difficult was the road that has allowed us to make such plans for the future. That is why we should have not merely a revolutionary attitude, but we should be firm in the implementation of what we have decided; we should try (?to cope with this) so as not to become deluded. We all know, and I say it once again, this is the greatest danger. That is why we are so carefully examining our past, with a mercilessly critical attitude and with truth. This is not easy. This calls for great courage. It sometimes seems as if that which we learn as a result of this approach is going to almost knock us off our course. On the basis of this (?impartial), truthful analysis we are seeking the truth. We are coming out of this without being weakened, because we have found major historical achievements—not just in the Soviet Union but also in Poland—and in spite of finding the tragic events in our history that tell very strongly of the fate of the societies, states, intelligentsia, the fate of individuals.

In spite of all this it has been instructive. Perhaps it is a case of experience from the past making us wiser, stronger, more patient and tolerant. This arms us with new knowledge, and I must say that it strengthens our spirit. Men of weak spirit are not able to resolve problems facing them. So we have had a moral cure of the community; and without moral health we could not manage. Hence perestroyka [preceding word in Russian] began with the decision to ask what kind of house we live in, what happened before, what is included in the house, and what is needed—a cosmetic overhaul, or a general overhaul? If a cosmetic overhaul in this case is insufficient, reconstruction [przebudowa] should be implemented in the material, moral, and spiritual spheres, in the sphere of culture.

Thanks to this we came to reconstruction [przebudowa], although we also had economic problems, and perhaps these forced us in the first stage to take care of the country—reconstruction [przebudowa]. But the essential objectives were the result of their intellectual and spiritual work, and perhaps never before have we had such close relations and deep understanding withour intelligentsia.

These are difficult situations. These are not merely pleasant speeches. This is the closeness that gives birth to trust; this is the closeness that developed on the basis of recognizing the principles and goals for which we are striving. It is an understanding of this, that neither the politicians nor the cultural forces of a country can fail to join together now in the name of the nation's interests. This helped us, I think, to choose the road, and this road converges with the road of your socialist renewal; but openness, glasnost was necessary.

(?We accepted) the guidelines, that one of the lessons of the past tells us that more than one attempt was made, which resulted from the politicians' disquiet, the disquiet of generations, of other generations of our intelligentsia, but all those programs began at some stage and afterward disappeared. The spark flew but the bonfire didn't catch fire, and it did not lead to a conflagration, a conflagration in the good sense, because real conflagrations are not [word indistinct].

It did not succeed. Do you know why? Because we did not think; we (?thought up) the plans and tried to implement them without broad participation by both the intellectual forces and the people on whose behalf we supposedly wanted to do it. We counted on (?crossing a threshold, expressing people's interests better than) [words indistinct] And all that had to be put in its place; at the center of all the issues, of all plans, there is [word indistinct] and responsibility particularly for such nations as [word indistinct] whose activities, on the historical scale and not just individual activities, made them deserve to be reckoned with and deserve life in our states to be better and correspond to the interests of the people.

In this way we have come to glasnost, democracy. I tell you honestly, perhaps it is the greatest discovery by communists, who began their struggle in order to abolish exploitation, all injustices based on private property and exploitation, to liquidate the exploitation of man, to tear man away from the means of production, from the soil, from spiritual values, from political [word indistinct] this is the driving force of all revolutionaries; we started the October Revolution from that. We followed Lenin in order to solve these problems; it appears that only now can we understand Lenin's approach because we wish to put man in his proper place in socialist community. In material processes to make him the master, and in political processes to make him the main [word indistinct]. And in spiritual affairs, because it is his country he cares that the moral health of the society is strong.

Perhaps it is bitter, but that is how it is. Most importantly, we stand firmly on the path, and we are determined to continue renewal because it is a general attitude in the Soviet community, although there are other attitudes—we will not try to gloss it over. The struggle continues, the struggle in the form of discussion and [word indistinct] political dialogue, by opposing positions. Shots are not being fired, but the struggle is serious, the struggle within the framework of socialist pluralism, outlooks.

All that characterizes our life today. It is still full of [word indistinct], but we have achieved new impulses of certainty and new proof in favor [word indistinct] about the support of the people for perestroyka [preceding word in Russian] at the 19th party conference. It was an unprecedented conference, an unprecedented event. Practically no one among the people living in the Soviet Union remembers such a discussion at a party conference. Finally, we felt for the first time how much [word indistinct] had gathered in our nation, that (?it) was ready to say what (?it) has to say, to each other, to the government. This will require further thought. It was an unprecedented event; but the essence is the most important—that the nation supports perestroyka [preceding word in Russian] and decidedly at that. The most decided speech, based on healthy criticism directed at the CPSU Central Committee and other republican authorities—I look here to Comrade Sokolov; the ministerial authorities—I look here to Comrade Shevardnadze; and directed also at the intelligentsia—here I look to you, the scientists who made speeches [word indistinct]—I see here Comrade Academician Fedorov. He made a speech at that conference. The most decided speeches were made by representatives of the worker (?aktiv).

Many of us felt awkward; we felt that we were late in relation to the moods of society. We have to go more quickly, and that is the most important conclusion to be drawn from the conference. One issue bothers us: The discussion should be transformed into action, into realpolitik, into actual practice. That is why, at the conference, during it, we passed a resolution, that we would not wait for the congress, we would not wait for changes in the constitution; all that will happen, but now we agree that what has been worked out at the conference must be at the basis of the activities of the central committee, the government, and all workplaces. That is how that brief resolution arose. Now, without delay, we have scheduled a Central Committee plenum, which will be tackling these very issues.

We have noticed in Poland that you have the same concerns. I feel that we are following the same road even more confidently, taking into consideration specific differences, which is obvious and clear. It was a great error to ignore specific differences; at last the dispute about the model of socialism is at an end. It is scientific socialism, and it must be realized in concrete conditions of every state taking into consideration tradition, level of development, political culture, and the potential of each country. This is my view of the model of socialism.

Nevertheless, acting independently, following the chosen road, we feel how much we need each other, perhaps as never before. There are many interesting things, in conversation with Comrade Jaruzelski, and with other representatives of Poland, during meetings with people, we found many things useful for us now when we are resolving new problems, and we will implement them after the conference [as heard].

I hope that our experience will be useful for you to some degree; perhaps it will inspire thinking, and this is very important. Hence, in the second part I would like to say that perhaps now, great chances are opening up for the forging of new relations between our peoples. I also know the feeling of your people; I sensed the feeling of the Poles, and I know the feeling of our people. We wish to meet each other half way with open hearts, and I would like to say that I myself and all my comrades did not expect such an opening.

There is an interest here, whose foundation creates a kind of movement of (?hearts). A man can be [words indistinct] you can ask him to come; you can ask him to say something—he will even come and say something, respecting his leadership, hospitality, and so on. But a man's face cannot be changed, the expression in his eyes, his mood, which always shows. When the process of accord is taking place—by accord we understood in fact that movement of the Poles, and perhaps that is what is most important—which is beginning now to characterize our relations. Before that, those relations were on the level of parties, governments, republics; now it is a movement of our nations toward one another.

Perhaps we will remain in these positions, which have always characterized by a great attachment to one's nation and loyalty and a desire to serve that nation. If there is such a [word indistinct], such intentions, such strivings, then the task for our policy is to promote it. I think that it is essential, important from the viewpoint of what affects two socialist states, neighboring states; we are speaking here about states linked by a common history, a past; and we cannot imagine a future other than living in friendship, fraternally, with Poland and jointly resolving the problems that our times present us with. I invite you, dear friends, Poles, representatives of the Polish intelligentsia; I invite our comrades, the Soviet intelligentsia: Help our nations, help implement the goals, the great goals, the humanitarian goals which we have formulated, having proposed perestroyka [preceding word in Russian] to the Soviet people and socialist renewal in Poland.

I would like only to repeat what I have told the young people: There are trains—and here I am recalling Comrade Jaruzelski's expression—which one must not miss. Equally, we must make sure that the intelligentsia does not remain outside this train of restructuring and renewal. That would mean no lesser losses than in the case of the young people and perhaps even greater ones, since the way young people act depends to a great extent on you, on your actions. In our common history, this is a time of very great actions, very important actions, and I am not afraid of exaggerating here, since we are talking about our fates. Thank you. [applause]

Second Speech at Castle

LD1407205788 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 14 Jul 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; second speech by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev at 14 July meeting with cultural representatives at Warsaw Castle—recorded]

[Text] Thank you for coming to this meeting with some very interesting arguments and for speaking about this sincerely and with great interest. I would like, perhaps, to respond just to some of the thoughts expressed here, and, first of all, to the fears over restructuring that were voiced here. I am not going to mention names because I might simply get these names wrong as I heard them. But those thoughts have been expressed, particularly the fear that only the intelligentsia will be in the search for restructuring and renewal and that there will not be any others. I think this is a reaction to my invitation to the intelligentsia of our countries to have their weighty say when the destinies of our countries and the destinies of our peoples are being decided. I considered it necessary to use the time I had here for that purpose, to emphasize and to express this idea, because this is the duty of our peoples' intelligentsia. It is the best part, the thinking part of every nation; serving the people is its duty, and this duty grows immeasurably at such historic moments.

But this certainly does not mean that there will be no working people, no working class, no peasantry; no people on board this restructuring train. No, I reacted to a certain statement made by one of our major scientific workers, an economist, who gave a very pessimistic assessment of the first results of restructuring and the economic reform. I said: Esteemed academician, while you and I are holding political discussions, or while you in your scientific circles are holding scientific discussions, and these are taking place in very heated forms now, the country nevertheless continues life, moves forward, and is being transformed. That is the weightiest voice—of the people, the working class—in support of restructuring. We politicians and representatives of the intelligentsia should never lose sight of that. Our work is very important, and blending with the labor of the workers and peasants it makes it different, it makes it noble, it makes it more highly productive—and that makes it possible to resolve a great deal. But in this, the decisive word belongs to the people.

I must say that however difficult everything is going—including the economic reform—it turns out that whereas in the past we often solved our problems by introducing an external economic factor—and oil helped in solving this—we also introduced a factor like expanding. We expanded the sale of alcoholic drinks and the production of drink. That also expanded income, and so on. But that was quite different from what is taking place now. What is taking place is that national income is growing, thanks to the national economy, thanks to industry, the services sphere, agriculture, and capital construction. A real, healthy process has begun in the economy. We are already achieving a 5 to 26 percent growth in the economy today. This is being done by people who have already been involved in the new relationships to a considerable extent and who will be involved even more widely beginning 1 January next year. At that time, the whole national economy will switch over to the principles of financial autonomy and the new methods of economic management.

That is why, of course, we want, and we understand, that the main passenger on the restructuring train is the working people, the working class, and the peasantry.

One more thought—about a hint I often hear in our country as well nowadays: It is one that has been heard here, too. Of course it is a good thing to hold a discussion; it is a good thing here to hold a discussion, but work must be done. Certainly, there in the Soviet Union you have been talking your heads off; you have become fond of discussions. But why don't you get down to work—to work. I have understood you. We also have a lot of comrades who say approximately the same thing. I want to say that there is a healthy thought present here, but we will preserve glasnost and discussion. Otherwise, we will not open up either the potential of the system or the intellectual potential of our people. This we insist on, and we will insist on it even if there are some people who do not like it, either in our country or in Poland. That is natural; there is nothing special in that. That is my answer to your second question.

Of course, you are right that we must engage scientific and technical progress in the interests of restructuring, using the appropriate economic mechanisms and using political mechanisms. That is the problem we have now set about dealing with thoroughly: restructuring everything that works toward scientific and technical progress, incentives, raising levels of competence, implementing very serious structural changes to restructure our national economy—and our main objective, to move our science and our country's machine-building strongly forward. Enormous capital investment and intellectual resources have been directed toward this end, and that is our priority.

I think the idea that sounded very much to the point and that was heard forcefully in many of the contributions here was that it is essential for us to move more confidently and rapidly toward interpreting history and our common history and to arm our people with historical knowledge. This will help us solve the tasks of today and tomorrow. I would not like to go into the specific details of this problem now. But I want to say that we have already had several conversations with Comrade Jaruzelski on this matter, and there are comrades here, members of the delegation accompanying me, who are now discussing with our Polish friends how a broader and systematic character can be imparted to this process to produce new works and assessments, including the use of literature and new sources that are becoming available to qualified specialists both in Poland and the Soviet Union. I think we are on the right road, but I feel that there is no satisfaction. There is a desire to advance more strongly than we have. I welcome that and am making a note for myself to support this for my own part.

But here I have noted other things, including such interesting questions as what is the general secretary's view on the role of the intelligentsia regarding religion. They have asked me to say something on that. I think we should accept Professor Suchodolski's suggestion—it is a good idea—that we publish and circulate this discussion. That will give those who have not yet said something the chance to have their say, and I will try to provide a written reply to the questions that have been touched upon here. I think it has been taken down, and they will give it to me. I want to take in what we have been talking about, not just by hearing it but by reading it. I think that will be interesting, and it might indeed be the book that will yet be a good stimulus for our joint efforts on the intellectual field on the road of cooperation.

Thank you for this meeting. I see that it was a necessary one for us, and it seems as though it was necessary for you, too. It is ending in a spirit of even greater understanding and respect. Thank you. [applause]

Meets With Journalists

LD1407133888 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1102 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Impromptu meeting between CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and unidentified journalists at Warsaw Castle; Gorbachev in Russian with superimposed Polish translation—live]

[Text] [Announcer, interrupting classical music program] I am awfully sorry, ladies and gentlemen, but we have another meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and journalists in the Nowoposelska room.

[Question] Well, we would not be journalists if we had failed to make use of an opportunity like this. I will not conceal the fact that it is with the cooperation of certain services that we have succeeded in finding ourselves here. Comrade Secretary, would you be kind enough to answer two or three journalists' questions?

[Gorbachev] I prefer two. [laughter]

[Question] This would not necessarily be for mass publication.

[Gorbachev] Three would be something of an accomplishment! [laughter]

[Question] Perhaps I will ask a question now. Let me first introduce myself. I am Podkowinski. I attended the Nuremberg Trial. I fought with the Soviet Army units. I entered Berlin. I have seen a bit of life indeed. My question is: I have been observing your visit in Poland. Let me put this visit in a different manner, as befits an old soldier. Previously, when the leaders of the Soviet Union came to Poland, they did not conduct a dialogue with us. You are the first Soviet leader to converse with the Polish nation wherever possible. This is a big thing, and we do feel it.

The second thing is this, and I wish to say it as befits a soldier. Yesterday you uttered a sentence which greatly impressed the Polish nation. Speaking of the joint struggle of Soviet soldiers and Polish soldiers defending peace and freedom, you made the following comparison: Stalingrad, Moscow, Lenino, Monte Cassino. The fact that you said Monte Cassino impressed Polish soldiers who had fought in the West and who had everywhere fought with you greatly. My question: Comrade General Secretary, did you sense this warmth among Polish society, when you were with us, following your speeches? I mean especially after these words.

[Gorbachev] I wish to say that our entire stay on Polish soil is accompanied by a kind of movement of soul of the Polish people and, after all, we do sense it. All of us are people who are alive, and you can then add to this the fact that we are a people with experience of communing with people. We know when an ordinary meeting or a rally is taking place, and we know when it is a matter of just hospitality. This time it was much more than hospitality. This was a genuine upsurge of the soul. Naturally, this evoked the same response among us. Our people have this enormous desire for the relations with this old neighbor, old nation—all the more because our entire history had good moments. All our people hope that our relations will now reach new expanses and that they should acquire much wider dimensions, becoming more humane, so that they are good relations between people, neighbors. Such relations should be obtained between fraternal, socialist nations. It is very important that we should be together, that we should exchange experiences. We did sense this desire on the part of Poles. Perhaps this is the greatest impression I will take with me from Poland.

[Question] Comrade General Secretary, you are a politician who enjoys a great popularity in the world. Are you not afraid that your popularity might some day evolve into a new personality cult (?just like it happened before you)?

[Gorbachev] I think that we understand what a personality cult is, that it is a certain ideological system, a certain mode of power. It is a stagnation of dialogue and restriction of democracy. What we are doing is quite the opposite. We are building everything on a firm foundation. We are renewing society. We want the people to be the masters of their fate. We are setting in motion democratic mechanisms that will allow the people self-determination so that they can trust in various activists or remove that trust from them. It is precisely this, these mechanisms, that are going to prevent a rebirth of the personality cult. Management by decree can never be repeated. We are providing guarantees through democracy that the personality cult is not going to be reborn. After all, ours is a state of the working people. My constant contact with the people is not just some political game or an attempt to win popularity or get some appropriate reaction. I just see it as necessary to feel the mood and react with appropriate speed. As far as popularity goes, I see it as follows: I have to prove myself through my daily work, not through popularity generated by the press.

[Question] A question regarding young people [words indistinct] with Wojciech Jaruzelski.

[Gorbachev] Indeed. I would like to tell you that for us the question of involving young people in restructuring and renewal is an essential issue: We will not be able to resolve today's tasks if young people remain on the sidelines of this process or participate in it only as observers. That is the most important thing. If we do not solve the task of involving young people in restructuring, we are not going to be able to achieve our objectives. And it is also a burden of responsibility which is going to rest on the shoulders of our young people. It was a priority matter in our discussions.

Final Talks With Jaruzelski

PM1507125188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jul 88 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under headline "Final Meeting at the PZPR Central Committee"]

[Text]Mikhail Gorbachev and Wojciech Jaruzelski summed up the Soviet leader's official friendly visit to Poland 14 July.

They both agreed that this was a major event in the history of relations between the two peoples, states and parties.

The visit graphically showed the immense potential of mutual sympathies, ingenuous interest, good will, and desire to be closer to each other on the solid basis of patriotism and Polish-Soviet friendship, the significance of which by far exceeded the framework of bilateral relations.

Enthusiasm and sincerity of feelings with which Poland welcomed Gorbachev and the heartfelt support for the Soviet policy of restructuring reflected the proximity of its ideas with the goals of Poland's socialist renewal.

The atmosphere of the visit, the content of the talks, discussion and large-scale contacts throughout the three days of the visit made great moral and political capital for a qualitatively new stage in Soviet-Polish relations.

Gorbachev and Jaruzelski discussed some issues of economic and inter-party cooperation and agreed on the implementation of several ideas and initiatives that emerged during the visit.

Attending the final discussion on the Soviet side were: E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party; CPSU Central Committee members V.I. Boldin, V.I. Ubrovikov, N.Ye. Kruchina, and A.S. Chernyayev; A.I. Vlasov, first deputy chief of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee; and R.P. Fedorov, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee department. On the Polish side: Z. Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the PPR Council of Ministers; J. Czyrek, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee; M. Gorywoda, candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Katowice PZPR Regional Committee; B. Kolodziejczak, member of the PZPR Central Committee Secretariat and Chief of the PZPR Central Committee first secretary's office; E. Kucza, chief of the PZPR Central Committee International Department; Polish Foreign Minister T. Olechowski; W. Natorf, Polish ambassador to the USSR; J. Lewandowski, deputy chief of the PZPR Central Committee International Department; and W. Gurnicki, leader of the group of advisers to the chairman of the Polish State Council.

The joint Soviet-Polish statement on the results of the visit was signed in the presence of all members of the Polish leadership and the Soviet delegation.

Joint Statement Signed

PM1507102988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 1, 2

["Soviet-Polish Joint Statement"]

[Text] The USSR and the PPR, the CPSU and the PZPR, guiding themselves by the supreme interests of the two fraternal peoples and the striving to cooperate closer in socialist renewal and restructuring, being aware of the importance of joint efforts directed at building a nuclear-weapons-free and non-violent world, declare their resolve to strengthen the Soviet-Polish alliance and relations of mutual understanding, sincere friendship and all-around cooperation.

The political will expressed in this statement accords with and serves the long-term aims set in the programme documents of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 10th PZPR Congress. It is dictated by the crucial stage in the historic destinies of socialism, which should in full measure tap and develop its creative potential and its inherent humanism.

I [subhead]

The Soviet Union and the Polish People's Republic hold a worthy place in the socialist world, which has entered the fifth decade of its existence as a mighty international formation, a vigorous component part of human civilization.

The entire system of political relations between the Soviet Union and People's Poland is based on equality, mutual responsibility, independence, responsibility to one's own people, as well as the right to independently solve questions of the country's development.

The sides are unanimous in their view that the effectiveness of their cooperation is promoted by the taking into account both of their own and common interests, by a respectful attitude to friends and allies, to the experience of each country, to the experience of each party.

In international affairs, the CPSU and the PPR regard the organic combination of their initiatives with the common coordinated line of socialist states as standard practice. [This and following additions and variations are provided by TASS in English at 1942 GMT on 14 July. Here TASS reads: "...the CPSU and the PPR regard combining their initiatives with the common..."] In economic relations, the sides intend to consistently observe principles of mutual advantage and mutual assistance. They regard exchange of experience of socialist construction and its joint summation as being central to the entire ideological cooperation.

The sides are of a high opinion of the effectiveness and importance of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and the PPR. The treaty has a beneficial influence on the development of cooperation, on the strengthening of friendly ties between the Soviet and the Polish peoples, ensures a reliable protection of their creative labor, and asserts the Soviet Union's and Poland's adherence to the policy of strengthening international peace.

The consonancy of the restructuring carried out in the Soviet Union and the course of socialist renewal pursued in Poland is a factor of big political importance. The closeness of their aims and tasks makes it possible to raise the entire range of bilateral relations to a qualitatively new level, to impart to them dynamism and more result-oriented in all spheres. The deepening and perfection of Soviet-Polish relations is directly facilitated by the comradely interest in each other's successes, by the unconditional acceptance of the objective nature of the national specificities, and the concrete historic conditions of socialist construction existing in each country.

The sides highly appreciate the mutual readiness to consult on all questions of interest. Exchange of experience of socialist construction in the political, socioeconomic, cultural, and other fields, especially along those directions where pioneering steps are being taken, is acquiring growing importance at the present stage. This entire work is being conducted and will be conducted in a comradely atmosphere of equality and trust, ruling out claims to knowing truth in the last instance. Sociopolitical practice alone, the real strengthening of socialism's positions can serve as the criterion of the value of any experience.

Soviet-Polish relations are based on full respect for the sovereign right of each country to independently determine the methods and forms of building socialism, the pace of socio-political transformations, the approaches to solving problems, and overcoming contradictions.

The Soviet Union and Poland put on record their resolve to cooperate in implementing the concept of socialism in the Leninist understanding of its humanistic nature. They are convinced that their interaction is valuable for revealing [here TASS reads: "utilizing"] in full measure the new system's tremendous potential in the interests of men of labor. On the eve of the 21st century, they are giving their answer to the challenge of the times and are multiplying their strength in fraternal cooperation with each other and the peoples of other socialist countries.

II [subhead]

The comradely cooperation of the CPSU and the PZPR, which is developing particularly dynamically in recent times, makes a big contribution to the strengthening of Soviet-Polish relations.

The development and deepening of political relations, the regular meetings and conversations at summit level, their truly comradely and open nature are of prime importance in this respect. The accords reached at summit level, the meetings of members of the leadership of both parties create a firm fabric of mutual understanding, thus making it possible to find solutions for any problems arising in the course of cooperation.

The CPSU and the PZPR come out for expanding and enriching interparty ties, for the possibilities inherent in them to be used better in mutual interest. This fully applies to ties along the line of local party bodies. Both parties will actively interact in further consolidating in the peoples of both countries the ideas of fraternal friendship and socialist internationalism.

The role of the supreme bodies of people's power is growing: the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Sejm of the PPR. The members of parliament of both states consider it important to exchange experience of perfecting the legislative foundations of the development of people's power and socialist self-government of the people, of strengthening the legal and treaty basis of Soviet-Polish relations, and intensifying parliamentary international activities in the interests of disarmament, strengthening security in Europe and in the whole world.

The sides will pay constant attention to strengthening interaction between the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the Council of Ministers of the PPR in solving major questions of Soviet-Polish cooperation. They will also press for more promptness, businesslike attitude, and initiative on the part of government institutions when implementing accords reached between our two countries.

The sides noted with satisfaction that the new climate in relations between the USSR and the PPR has influenced the expansion of the socio-political base of their cooperation and created possibilities for a vigorous participation of the United Peasant Party and the Democratic Party in Soviet-Polish ties. The signing of an agreement on cooperation between the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Ties With Foreign Countries and the Patriotic Movement for National Rebirth has become an important event in Soviet-Polish relations. The sides believe that systematic contacts between socio-political organizations will make it possible to establish a wider exchange between people.

The sides declare for the development of ties between trade union organizations and hold that trade unions are one of the main public forces advancing socialist socio-economic reforms.

The extensive public activity of the societies of Soviet-Polish and Polish-Soviet friendship to spread knowledge about the two countries and establish new, closer ties between the Soviet and Polish public was noted with appreciation. The need was stressed for them to further search for ways of expanding their activity and enriching the methods of work.

It is a very important task to impart greater dynamism to the cooperation of republic, regional, city, and district soviets of people's deputies with voivodship, city, and Gmina people's councils, to contacts between their executive bodies and deputies. Heightened attention will be given to the development of ties between twinned republics, regions of the Soviet Union and Poland's voivodships, to exchange of advanced experience, to the merging of efforts in the joint practical solution of economic, social, cultural, educational and other questions.

The sides intend to consistently pursue a policy of raising the effectiveness of economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Poland, viewing it as a key factor promoting the solution of economic and social tasks in both countries. In the course of further implementation of the long-term program of economic, scientific, and technological cooperation between the USSR and the PPR to the year 2000, and the Soviet-Polish comprehensive program of scientific and technological progress for a longer term, work will be continued to deepen the specialization of production and co-production by way of making more intensive use of direct ties between enterprises and research organizations, setting up joint enterprises and developing other progressive forms of cooperation. A long-term impulse to the process of integration of the economies of the two countries will be imparted by the new concept of economic, scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR and the PPR for a period of 15-20 years. It will become an organic component part of the collective concept of the international socialist division of labor of CEMA member countries till the year 2005.

Efforts will be made to perfect the mechanism of economic interaction in conditions of the functioning of enterprises on the principles of cost-accounting and the granting of complete independence to them. The idea here is to make fuller use of the possibilities of monetary-commodity relations, foreign-exchange, financial, and credit instruments of cooperation and to restructure its organizational and juridical regulators. [Here TASS reads: "..of monetary-commodity relations, monetary-financial and credit instruments..."]

Every possible assistance will be given to the expansion and invigoration of cross-border trade and economic ties, to turning areas adjoining the Soviet-Polish border into a zone of enhanced economic activity.

The reform and restructuring of the economic mechanism, now being implemented in Poland and the Soviet Union and coinciding by their principles and aims, create real possibilities for moving on to a qualitatively new stage and level of bilateral economic relations. The utilization of these possibilities and opportunities requires the working out by joint efforts of bold and modern approaches meeting the requirements of the present and the future. It is necessary to overcome more vigorously the objective difficulties that put a brake on cooperation, to struggle against the bureaucratism and conservatism standing in the way of its development.

It was noted with satisfaction that Soviet-Polish cooperation is becoming ever more multifaceted, encompassing new fields and enriching the practice of the internationalist interaction of socialist states. A special role in this respect belongs to the declaration on Soviet-Polish cooperation in the field of ideology, [TASS omits rest of paragraph] science, and culture, which is seen by the sides as a long-term program of joint efforts in the spiritual sphere and as a way of combining more fully the considerable intellectual potential of the USSR and Poland.

The declaration outlined the main directions of the qualitative restructuring of ties in the field of the superstructure. It has put in action new levers, opened up broad prospects of the ideological cooperation of both parties. Problems set forth by life are now being solved faster, and the exchange of experience has been expanded. This facilitates a deeper mutual understanding, a growth of mutual trust, and the drawing closer together of the Soviet and the Polish peoples.

In the opinion of both sides, substantial progress has been achieved in the field of cultural cooperation. The qualitatively new content appearing in it is a result of the joint search of possiblities for the broadest possible public participation in cultural life and the democratization of the sphere of culture. The exchanges in the filed of culture are becoming less formal while the establishment of direct ties between institutions and cultural figures are becoming ever more effective and concrete. The two states will create optimum conditions for a still broader acquaintance of the broadest sections of the Soviet and the Polish public with the achievements of Soviet and Polish culture. The activity of the recently opened Information and Cultural Center of the PPR in Moscow and the long activity of the House of Soviet Science and Culture in Warsaw facilitate the mutual drawing together of the culture of both peoples and familiarization with their life.

Scientific cooperation has expanded. Both sides are working to develop its new forms. Cooperation should be based on businesslike plans and utilize better the existing possibilities for further intensifying ties between research institutes and establishments of higher learning that maintain direct contacts.

Both sides noted that the mass media have mutually started to cover more extensively life in the USSR and the PPR. Cooperation in this field should be further perfected, facilitating the forming of a realistic image of a partner-country, ally, and friend.

The new climate in mutual relations, especially after the signing of the declaration, has made it possible to tackle difficult and complex problems of the so called "balnk spots" connected with the history of Russian-Polish and Soviet-Polish relations.

Noting the progress in the work of the joint commission of historians that has been set up, the sides stressed that this work should be speeded up, that information should be drawn deeper from trustworthy sources and all aspects of the history of relations between our countries should be studied.

The sides confirm the resolve expressed in the declaration to give an objective interpretation to all episodes of the past, including dramatic ones. It is important for such clarification to serve the further strengthening of mutual trust and friendship, for the public consciousness in both countries to be cleansed of everything that is extraneous and impedes a deeper mutual understanding of our peoples. The deciphering of the "blank spots" relates not only to dramatic but also to little known glorious pages in the history of cooperation showing the joint struggle for national and social liberation, for the freedom and independence of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Poland.

In this connection, the importance was stressed of the adopted decisions to perpetuate in the Soviet Union the memory of prominent personalities of Poland's worker's movement, science and culture and in the PPR the memory of prominent Russian, Ukrainian, Belorussian, and Lithuanian personalities of the revolutionary, workers' and communist movement, literature and culture, military commanders, and other participants in the struggle for Poland's liberation. This is a tribute of the profound respect that the Soviet and Polish public have for the outstanding representatives of the past generations who laid the foundations of the friendship of our peoples.

The drawing together of the Soviet and the Polish peoples is becoming a cause of millions. The involvement in this process of representatives of all classes and social strata, nationalities and ethnic groups, people of various age groups, occupations, and individual aptitudes enriches the palette of mutual sympathies and ties, and places Soviet-Polish friendship on a broader and stronger foundation.

The sides will promote the expansion of contacts between socio-political organizations, creative associations, people working in science, education, culture, and the mass media, as well as between work collectives, and create favorable conditions for tourist trips. The dialogue that has begun between the churches of the Soviet Union and Poland, which guide themselves by ideas of peace and cooperation, is evidence of new approaches.

Practical measures to develop extensive contacts between people, to perfect the visa-free and customs regimen of trips by citizens of the two countries, and to make easier genuine human contact between them are envisaged in the interests of advancing the entire complex of Soviet-Polish relations to new frontiers.

Soviet people of Polish nationality living in the USSR and PPR citizens of Ukrainian, Belorussian, and Lithuanian extarction could make a useful contribution to the strengthening of friendship between the peoples of our countries. This will be facilitated by the creation of possibilities for the Polish ethnic group in the USSR to organize cultural and enlightening societies, to study their native tongue and culture. A similar role is played by socio-cultural societies of Belorussians, Lithuanians, and Ukrainians in Poland.

A bigger responsibility than ever before for the future of socialism is to be shouldered by the young generation. The young citizens of both countries are to make their contribution to the cause of forming new socio-political relations, developing democracy, perfecting the administration of the state and society, raising the efficiency of the national economy, enriching spiritual values, and ensuring social justice.

The signing of a document on the cooperation of the youth of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Polish People's Republic, planned shortly, will create new possibilities for expanding contacts between the young generations of the Soviet Union and Poland. The sides shall strive for youth cooperation to permeate the whole of society and encompass all spheres of the socio-political, economic, and spiritual life of our peoples.

[Here TASS includes a subhead: "III"]

The Soviet Union and the Polish People's Republic proceed in their policy in the international arena from the premise that mankind has no choice but to start building a secure and stable world free of nuclear weapons and all other means of the mass annihilation of people, a world without wars and violence.

Despite the entire complexity of the world situation, there is reason to note also the growth of positive tendencies. Awareness of the indivisibility of peace and the shared destiny of all peoples is growing. The ideas of the new political thinking are beginning to penetrate the sphere of practical policy and concrete actions.

The Soviet program of a nuclear-free world, proclaimed in January 1986, helped move the cause of disarmament off dead center. The first major breakthrough has been accomplished in the direction of real nuclear disarmament: The Soviet-American INF Treaty has been concluded. Also, certain progress has been achieved at the talks between the USSR and the United States on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms in linkage with observance of the ABM Treaty within an agreed-upon period of time. In addition, a persistent struggle is in progress for the prohibition of chemical weapons and the ending of nuclear tests, and work is nearing completion on the mandate of the talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. The importance and major significance of the Geneva agreements on the political settlement of the external aspects of the Afghan problem are obvious.

Disarmament is the main road to strengthening security for all. In the opinion of the sides, the disarmament process should be given a continuous, steadily growing, and deepening character; favorable possibilities should be utilized for achieving new frontiers in this endeavor. For these aspirations of the peoples to materialize, it is necessary to give up obsolete stereotypes, stop cultivating the enemy image, and renounce the from-positions-of-strength policy.

The PPR fully supports the effective policy of the USSR, which in accordance with the program of the 27th CPSU Congress is directed at attaining lasting peace and security throughout the world. The PPR highly evaluates the initiatives and personal contribution of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to the implementation of this political line, a line which has the Polish people's respect and appreciation.

As participants in the Warsaw Pact, the USSR and the PPR attach special importance to the speediest opening of talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, resolutely coming out for the elimination of existing imbalances and asymmetries in this field. They are ready for a realistic, constructive discussion of these questions. The aim should be the lowering of military potentials to a level necessary only for defense and not for offensive actions.

The Soviet Union fully supports the Jaruzelski Plan—the PPR's initiative concerning the reduction of armaments and increasing trust in central Europe. If implemented, this plan would make it possible to lower the level of military confrontation between the two military-political alliances and strengthen European security.

Poland expresses full support for the Soviet proposal to create a center that would serve the lessening of the danger of war and the prevention of a sudden attack in Europe, being convinced that this would facilitate the stabilization of the situation on the continent as well as the strengthening of peace and security. Poland proposes to locate it on its territory should the interested countries express their consent to this.

The sides shall further consistently come out for the expansion and deepening of the CSCE process along all directions and in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act. The sides shall also press for a resolute turn for the better in relations between all European states. They will vigorously participate in the building of the common European home, regarding this as a real possibility to back up with collective efforts the material guarantees of the security of the continent as a whole and each country separately, to solve all problems at the negotiating table, to create an economic mechanism that will accord with the interests of each and all, to place on a collective basis the cause of saving the natural environment, to facilitate the preservation and development of national cultural traditions, and to develop cooperation in the humanitarian field.

The invigoration of the peace activities of churches and religious societies in the name of mankind's survival acquires considerable importance at the present stage of struggle for the improvement of the international situation.

The Soviet Union and the Polish People's Republic regard strict respect by all states of the territorial-political realities that have formed as a result of World War II and post-war development as an imperative condition of lasting peace and security in Europe. At the same time, this is a necessary condition of the all-European [here TASS reads: "...condition of the CSCE process..."] process which rests on principles of trust, peaceful cooperation, disarmament, and universal security. Any encroachments on these realities, on the inviolability of existing borders, including the border along the Odra and Nysa Luzycka, have been and will be most resolutely repulsed.

As they develop and perfect the relations of alliance existing between them, the USSR and the PPR will make their contribution to strengthening the unity and cohesion of the Warsaw Pact member states, which are closely interacting in international affairs and jointly struggling for disarmament, for a safer world.

The Soviet Union and People's Poland, the CPSU and the PZPR, are fully resolved actively and purposefully to interact and cooperate with all other states, political parties, and public organizations in efforts directed at removing the danger overhanging mankind and at preserving civilization. This lofty aim fully accords with the will and sentiments of the world public, which wants the creation of a nuclear-free world in conditions of the recognized right of each people and each country to freedom of socio-political choice.

Warsaw, July 14, 1988

[Signed] Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the PPR State Council

Both Leaders Meet Journalists

LD1407223988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 Jul 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A joint Soviet-Polish statement was signed today. [video shows Gorbachev and Jaruzelski signing document] The document was signed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Wojciech Jaruzelski. [video shows Gorbachev addressing journalists after signing ceremony]

[Gorbachev] I would like to say a big thanks to all the comrades on the Polish side for the notion, the idea of this visit. It was, I think, a correct idea, a serious one, and its realization has started our relations in a new direction. [words indistinct] we have just held our concluding discussion and what we agreed on was to combine the tackling of long-term problems with those which have to be tackled without delay, particularly contacts to exchange experience, human contacts, and exchanges between the parties and parliaments, and many other interesting questions. Life itself is clearly pushing us toward doing things this way.

Thank all of you for everything that has been done for us here on Polish soil. We have enjoyed it. Thank all of you. I would also like to take advantage of the fact that we are all here together to convey greetings to you, dear comrades, from the whole Soviet leadership. Bear in mind that we are disposed to cooperate with you at the very highest (?standard), so there you are. Thank you. [applause]

[Correspondent D. Biryukov] Mikhail Sergeyevich, the Soviet Union [words indistinct] they have covered your visit to Poland very well in the Soviet Union and other countries. From interviews in the streets, we know how the Poles see you; how do you see Poland (?through the prism) of this visit?

[Gorbachev] I have been very impressed. I think that today's Poland, revived by the hands of the Polish people after such a long historical path but now within the framework of socialism, travelling that path, has reached great heights, both in the sense of developing their country, the evolution of the state system, the evolution of the people as a nation, and the evolution of the economy and culture. So Poland appears to us to be a modern state. This does not in the least deny what our friends and we know: that we have problems, that there are great tasks. This is because we are passing through very crucial phase of historical development. This applies to all the socialist countries with certain differences and nuances. We bear all this in mind when I say that Poland appears to us in the way I mentioned earlier. The most vivid impression we have is that we can see reciprocal movement—which perhaps corresponds to the very same movement on the part of our people—toward friendship, cooperation, and rapprochement. This is perhaps the most vivid impression, and it is one that inspires us very much.

[Biryukov] Thank you. I would like to put a question to Comrade Jaruzelski. What could be considered the main result of this visit?

[Jaruzelski in Russian] First, I would like to fully endorse the assessment which Mikhail Sergeyevich has just given. I consider this visit to be historic because it elevates the working and business aspects of our cooperation—and I would say the emotional, the human aspect, so to speak—to a higher stage.

This is very important, especially for us in Poland. As you know, the Poles are a very emotional people, and they are reacting very strongly to these aspects of the visit. It went so well and with such enthusiasm: first, because Poland has shown complete solidarity with restructuring and has shown that we are taking the same path and are on the same path of change.

Second, Mikhail Sergeyevich's personality, his attitudes, his manner of chatting with people, his approach to people have conquered our society, so to speak, and we were very pleased to see that our people welcomed our dear guest in a—I don't know if the word is correct—spontaneous way, that is, without being organized.

We now have to continue. During our talks, I said that a large amount of capital has been created. Capital can be placed in a cashbox and locked in a safe, where it does no work. But the thing is that this capital must be put to work; it has to work to continue to produce new results and new assets. We are fully resolved to take precisely this path. This is the most important thing.

[Biryukov] Thank you.

Medvedev, Czyrek Assess Visit

LD1407222988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 Jul 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A news conference for Polish and foreign journalists took place in Warsaw today. Taking part in it were Comrades Medvedev and [Polish Foreign Minister] Czyrek.

Assessing the results of the visit by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary to the Polish People's Republic, Comrade Medvedev said among other things:

[Begin Medvedev recording] The visit reflected the closeness of our parties, countries, and peoples and the open and committed nature of relations between them which has formed over the past few years. Both sides agreed that, perhaps as never before, Soviet-Polish relations are characterized by this open and committed nature and by friendly mutual understanding. This applies not only to the search for, but also by the real mutual understanding on literally all issues, in all areas of our relations, whether that is economic cooperation, cooperation in the infrastructure, or the mutual understanding of approaches to resolving complex issues of our rich, and to a considerable extent, joint but also at times dramatic history.

One cannot help but ask the question: What is the reason for that? What is the basis for relations of that kind between our parties, our countries, and peoples? I believe that the reason lies in the fact that a new style of relations has been developing. That also applies to relations among the socialist countries as a whole. But perhaps this new style of relations found its most graphic reflection in Soviet-Polish relations.

Fraternal Poland has lived through difficult years in the recent past. And throughout these years, we sought with a great deal of understanding of the difficulties, not only with sympathy but with the desire to help in everything that is in our power, in order to overcome those difficulties, be they of the the economic, foreign policy, or any other nature. [sentence as heard]

We approve wholeheartedly and with full understanding the program of socialist renewal and the program of Poland's national rebirth. We believe that that policy is carried out by the Polish leadership headed by Comrade Jaruzelski in a very profound, thorough, and tactful way. [end recording]

[Announcer] The journalists were also addressed by Comrade Czyrek, who said in part:

[Begin Czyrek recording in Polish with superimposed Russian translation] The visit passed in the context of the development of our good-neighborly allied relations and on the basis of the principles Comrade Medvedev spoke about—in particular, the principles of sovereign equality, mutual respect, friendship, independence, and responsibility for the tackling of the issues of each of the countries and each of the parties. The visit took place in the context of what is historically the highest level of Polish-Soviet relations, both in terms of their foundations and their superstructure, in the context of an innovative and creative search for, and adoption of, new solutions in the development of Polish-Soviet relations and Polish-Soviet cooperation. The visit took place at a time which is important for Europe and for the world, important in the process of resolving important problems associated with coexistence and cooperation in conditions of peace and security, international security. [end recording]

[Announcer] Replies were then given to journalists' questions.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified journalist] Are there grounds for hoping that one result of the visit will be the creation of a further network, so to speak, or expansion in the setting up of joint enterprises—that which we also call a higher level of economic integration? If there are, what is the basis for them?

[Medvedev] Real headway along the path of production cooperation and scientific and technical cooperation, and particularly in the creation of joint enterprises, is not of the kind we initially hoped for. Progress along this path is going rather slowly and is meeting with numerous obstacles. Above all, we have not as yet achieved compatibility between the economic mechanisms of the two countries, and this applies not just to internal mechanisms, but also to economic mechanisms of external economic relations. This is the conclusion that has been reached by our country. I think the Polish side has reached it, too. Certain lessons stem from this conclusion, for us at any rate. We must move more rapidly along the path of refining our internal economic mechanism, and along the path of changing and reforming the mechanism of external economic relations. This, I think, answers your question. The refinement of economic mechanisms opens up fresh prospects in this context. We hope that in the next few years, economic relations in their most up-to-date forms will acquire very great development in connection with this. [end recording]

Political & Social

Further on Unrest in Armenia, Azerbaijan Region

Presidium Debate 18 Jul

PM1507123388 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 29, 16-22 Jul 88 (Signed to Press 14 Jul 88) p 5

[Special correspondent V. Voytenko dispatch under rubric "Reportage From the Scene of Events": "Freedom Must Not Be Used for Evil Ends"—first paragraph is ARGUMENTY I FAKTY introduction]

[Text] V. Voytenko, a special correspondent of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY who is in Yerevan at the moment, reports on current events in Armenia.

The steep hill in the capital of Armenia where the Matenadaran ancient manuscript repository building is located is now the site of mass demonstrations. According to information of the republic Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Yerevan Gorispolkom, the further holding of rallies in the city center on Theater Square was deemed inadvisable.

...Those addressing the crowd at the Matenadaran building speak of the events of recent days, of the strikes which are taking place not only in Yerevan but also in Leninakan. They are also discussing the brochure "Nagorno- Karabakh" which has been published by the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences. They argue that certain news media are not reporting the whole truth about events in Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. In this context someone proposes that all contact with representatives of the mass media be broken off.

However, when I introduce myself and ask people, not without a certain amount of apprehension, to translate what has been said into Russian (the speakers are speaking in Armenian), people are most helpful despite the said appeal.

And how does the republic leadership assess the situation? The view at the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee is that the situation in the city remains tense.

"In order to ensure that the situation does not get out of control," A. Ovsepyan, chief of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee lecturer group, told me, "Central Committee and party gorkom officials and our freelance lecturers—among them such respected people as G. Galoyan, vice president of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences; G. Simonyan, director of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism and corresponding member of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences; Professor L. Khushudyan, head of the Yerevan University History Department; V. Barkhudaryan, deputy director of the Armenian Academy of Sciences History Institute; and many others—speak on television, write in the press, and address rallies.

"They speak about such unfading values as the interests of the state as a whole and the sense of a united motherland and stamp out rumors.

"On 13 July an integrated political day was held throughout the republic. Around 2,000 members of the top and rayon leadership components addressed people all over Armenia.

"It is not always possible to establish contact with people, to persuade them. However, at the electrical equipment plant in Artikskiy Rayon, for instance, it was decided to review the decision to strike after the lecturers had spoken."

I was told more than once by inhabitants of Yerevan that only striking would enable them to achieve anything, because otherwise consideration of their demands would be constantly postponed.

Here is the opinion of Doctor of Juridical Sciences V. Nazaryan, head of the department of state-administration and international law of the Yerevan State University Law Faculty.

"In my view the situation at the moment is very complex. I have frequently spoken at rallies, on television, and in the press about the need to act and struggle within the framework of the law. However, the people's spontaneous activity [samodeyatelnost] which we are currently witnessing will not, I believe, help to resolve the Karabakh problem and may, on the contrary, ruin everything.

"The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium is to discuss the Nagorno-Karabakh question 18 July. So why hold rallies? In order to bring home the acuteness of the problem to the top bodies? In order to put pressure on the authorities? In my view this is an incorrect method.

"And I would say the following about the possible impact of the strike on the final decision: The organizers of these measures seem to see some connection between their actions and the normal work which is under way on this question at various levels of state power. It is true that strikes have coincided with the adoption of specific decisions at times. From this the conclusion was drawn that it was all thanks to the strikers. However, in reality such a cause-and-effect relation does not exist."

Headlines such as "Let Us Be Sensible," or "Our Duty Is To Build" are a constant feature in Yerevan newspapers. Contributions have come from party officials, scientists, and respected people. According to available information the strongest impact was made by an article by Catholicos of All Armenia Vazgen I, who wrote that freedom must not be used for evil ends. In conclusion he said that if people did not listen to him, he would curse his fate and fall silent for ever.

There is evidence of some positive changes. The work of public transport is gradually returning to normal, food stores are open, and flights to and from Zvartnots Airport are operating according to the timetable. However, the decision adopted at the Matenadaran building to continue the strike until 18 July remains in force.

Yerevan Reports NKAO Vote

NC1507142088 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 13 Jul 88

[Text] The oblast Soviet of Peoples' Deputies of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] met in Stepanakert on 12 July. The meeting was attended by 101 of the total 150 deputies. A decision to remove the NKAO from the Azerbaijan SSR's structure was approved. The decision states that the oblast Soviet of Peoples' Deputies of the NKAO considers that the decision adopted by the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet meeting on 15 June 1988 is the only acceptable solution for the oblast. The meeting assigned the ispolkom of the oblast Soviet of Peoples' Deputies to rename, in an orderly manner, the NKAO as the Artsakh Armenian Automomous Region.

Although the deputies at the meeting called on the workers to end their strikes, on 13 July all the city's establishments were idle. Private and public enterprises were not operating. Shops for staple goods (?were also closed). Agro-economic work continues in the fields.

TRUD on Stepanakert Situation

PM1507120188 Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Jul 88 p 4

[Report by K. Tatyanina under the rubric "We Report the Details" and general heading: "What Is Happening"]

[Text] Azerbaijan SSR—At a newspaper kiosk not far from the entrance I met a group of workers from the Baku oil refinery named for the 23d CPSU Congress heatedly discussing the latest TASS report from Stepanakert.

"You know, whatever I am doing, all my thoughts are about one thing: What, at the end of it all, is actually happening there? When will people calm down and realize that such actions are intolerable?" operator Rafael Arturovich Tumanyan said sorrowfully. "And that illegal, unconstitutional decision by the oblast soviet of people's deputies session on withdrawal from the Azerbaijan SSR—is it not clear that this is a direct violation of our laws? It is obviously to some people's advantage that the situation should definitively enter an impasse and become still more complicated."

That there are indeed people who would like this is also borne out by the fact that the workers of the law enforcement organs in Stepanakert have recently discovered a considerable quantity of homemade weapons: grenades, pistols, cartridges, incendiary mixtures. I was told by the workers of the USSR MVD investigation group that criminal cases have been started with regard to these facts.

The situation in Stepanakert continues to be tense. Despite the call to return to work heard at that same session, the strike is continuing. Enterprises, transport, stores selling industrial commodities, consumer services, and a number of institutions are not operating.

Stepanakert City Idle

LD1407172688 Moscow TASS in English 1707 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Stepanakert, Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region of Azerbaijan July 14 TASS—The situation in Stepanakert remains unchanged, with factories still idling and food and water supplies erratic.

But the rural areas of the Nagorno-Karabakh region offer a contrast to the city's inactivity.

It is enough to drive just a few kilometers out of the city to get a feel of a different life: There are harvesters operating in the fields, reapers scurrying on hill slopes and trucks with hay and grain going on dirt roads.

Farmers at the Shmidt agricultural cooperative in the Martuni district, for example, are fast reaping crops in lowland areas and taking in a good harvest—an average of up to 30 centners of grain from a hectare in some places.

The priority need now is to harvest all grain crops without losses and then plow fields again in time.

The harvesting campaign is picking up at other farms in the district as well.

Stepanakert Transport Halted

LD1507151988 Moscow TASS in English 1429 GMT 15 Jul 88

[Text] Stepanakert (Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region) July 15 TASS—Enterprises, passenger and freight motor transport are at a standstill here and many institutions are closed. There are more than 130 unloaded freight cars at the railway station. Even containers with fruits are not being transported out of the station and already more than 300 of them have accumulated there.

A tragedy happened in Stepanakert this morning. A certain G.S. Adamyan murdered his wife, two relatives, badly wounded a two-year-old child of his wife's sister and also tried to kill his son. The motives of his actions are being investigated. All the victims and the murderer are Armenians. The identity of the murderer was quickly established as a result of prompt action by investigators. Adamyan has a criminal record: He was sentenced twice for hooliganism and inflicting grave bodily injuries. Vigorous measures have been taken to apprehend the killer. Information about him was broadcast by the local television.

The population of Stepanakert is exhausted by the obtaining situation. People have forgotten about weddings and family gatherings. The incidence rate of illnesses caused by nervous strain has grown.

Stepanakert Situation 'Tense'

PM1507151188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report headlined "Situation in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast"]

[Text] Baku—The situation in Stepanakert, capital of the Nagorno-Karabakh region, remains tense. Despite measures being adopted, the strike in the city is still on. Field work is under way in rural areas in the oblast.

The complex and tense situation in Armenia is continuing to cause mass migration of Azerbaijanians from Armenia to Azerbaijan.

Azerbaijanians arriving from Armenia have been provided with temporary accomodation in 43 districts in this republic, according to a special commission formed at the Council of Ministers of Azerbaijan. The largest number of such citizens are in the Nakhichevan ASSR, in the Shamkhorskiy, Kubinskiy, Kazakhskiy, and Zhdanovskiy Rayons. Staffs operating under the leadership of local party organizations have been set up in the rayons to perform explanatory work.

As of today, some 20,000 people (more than 4,000 families) have gone from Armenia to Azerbaijan.

The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee has been trying to normalize the situation in predominantly Azerbaijani locations in Armenia.

In agreement with the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, they were recently visited by two groups of senior party and state officials.

At the request of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, senior staff workers from the CPSU Central Committee are currently staying in those areas.

Thanks to the work done, several hundred Azerbaijanis have returned to Armenia over the past few weeks.

Contrary to rumors, there have been no cases of Azerbaijani arrivals from Armenia taking over the apartments and houses of Armenians who have gone out of Azerbaijan.

Yerevan July 15 TASS—Armenians keep arriving in Armenia in connection with events in the Nagorno-Karabakh area and the tragedy in Sumgait.

According to local governing councils, there were 7,265 people (1,598 families) from Baku, Sumgait, Mingechaur, Kazakh, Shamkor and other cities in Azerbaijan staying in Armenia on July 13.

Essential measures are being taken to provide them with housing and jobs.

Yerevan Strike Continues

PM1407170388 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 15 Jul 88 p 3

[Report by special correspondents Yu. Belanov and N. Ordinyan: "Yerevan, 14 July"]

[Excerpt] Rallies at which the speakers essentially incite people to continue striking are still continuing to take place in the Armenian capital. In the city's leading rayon—Leninskiy Rayon—today 9,000 people failed to take their labor watch. This means that one in every three is still not working, and the production shortfall thus continues to increase.

The situation is roughly the same in the city's other industrial rayons. Altogether in Yerevan today approximately 40,000 people were not at their machine tools. [passage omitted]

Output Lost by Yerevan Strike

PM1507143788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Special correspondents S. Bablumyan and P. Gutiontov report: "Yerevan, 15 July"]

[Text] We start every morning by touring the city to try to determine by outward signs whether the current day will be a working day. "Outward signs" include how many buses, streetcars, and taxis are visible on the streets, the number of people waiting at stops, the mood of workers assembling at entrances, and the tone of their replies to the questions we ask them.

It should be repeated yet again that figures obtained from official sources are rather contradictory. For instance, everyone entering an enterprise is deemed to have turned up for work—irrespective of whether they stay by their machine tools for a whole shift or go home after an hour. A more objective figure is the total loss from unproduced output. It is calculated each evening by the republic's State Committee for Statistics. Unfortunately, this figure is still not falling.

At the same time, it seems that more and more Yerevan people are starting to think about the pointlessness of the "form of protest" they are using. Here is just one example. The republic's maternity hospital has not received any medical oxygen for more than 10 days now—the oxygen supply station at Lusakert is on strike. Yet on average the maternity hospital uses up to eight cylinders every day. But now the hospital has run out of oxygen, and the doctors simply do not know what they will do if the strike at Lusakert goes on. Supplies to the maternity hospital of other medicines and materials have also been disrupted...

"I am perfectly well aware," R. Abramyan, chief physician at the maternity hospital, said, "that the atmosphere in the city has reached the point where any appeal to end the strike and return to work is adamantly opposed by certain hotheads and not heeded. Yet I think that, both as a doctor and as a person responsible for protecting the health of mothers and children, I am entitled to demand that we should not be prevented from doing our job."

Party and soviet organs are trying to rectify the situation, but mainly by traditional methods: Various conferences, sessions, and meetings are held almost constantly. But the situation remains tense.

Kirovakan Situation Reported

PM1507110588 Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Jul 88 p 4

[Report by special correspondent Yu. Petrov under the "We Report the Details" rubric and general heading: "What Is Happening?"]

[Text] Kirovakan—From the movement of the construction cranes and trucks and the smoke above the plant smokestacks it was obvious that Kirovakan was working. Not in its entirety, it is true—in this city too there are striking enterprises. When I arrived there were nine of these enterprises, increasing the tally of damage and material loss. This tally runs into millions of rubles.

The city's largest enterprise is the S. Shaumyan sewn goods association. Over 7,000 people work here.

The collective did not support the irresponsible call to strike. "We have no right to frivolous steps," party committee Secretary F. Gevorkyan said.

I met with one of the association's labor dynasties. The head of the dynasty, P. Selimyan, is 63 years old. His son Valeriy is an engineer and his daughters Zemfira and Karina also work here. His son's wife, Tatyana, heads a laboratory and is a candidate of technical sciences.

What does the head of the dynasty think of the events in the city? He is in favor of accelerating the solution of the problems of Nagorno-Karabakh, but believes that in any event they should not stand idle but should work. "In our shop no one has stopped work," P. Selimyan says. "People understand that their enterprise is a link in a chain and this chain should not be broken."

Tatyana, a representative of the younger generation, believes that the strike is developing into pressure on those organs engaged in the problems of Nagorno-Karabakh, and that is intolerable.

I should like to mention one more detail. People of the most diverse nationalities work in the association: Armenians, Kurds, Greeks, Azerbaijanis, Russians... Kirovakan city is multinational. There are eight Azerbaijani settlements surrounding it. There have been no incidents involving them. In any event, the Azerbaijanis are also trading in fruit at the market...

Arutyunyan Meets Workers

NC1407155888 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 13 Jul 88

[Text] The regular weekly political day was held in the republic today. On this day Armenian SSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo members and deputies, members of the Armenian SSR Communist Party (?inspection committee), leading party, soviet, and economic workers, and workers of fundamental enterprises held a constructive and frank dialogue on the major problems of the collectives. Approval was voiced everywhere for the resolutions adopted at the 19th all-union party conference responding to the Soviet people's fundamental benefits and aimed at restructuring social life, ensuring economic and social progress, developing the process of democratization and glasnost, and improving the legislative activity of the highest organs of power.

During the political day meetings, the workers expressed great concern over the situation created in the republic. They noted the need for ensuring law and order and taking all measures to return the [word indistinct] rhythm to work.

Noting that the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh demands a solution, many of the political day participants emphasized that the [words indistinct], and especially the strikes and other (?manifestations), harm rather than help matters. The participants called on workers to devote themselves zealously to work, to solving the problems of reconstruction, and to realizing the goals propounded by the 19th all-union party conference.

Within the framework of political day, Suren Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, met with workers of Yerevan's polyvinyl acetate production association. He acquainted himself with the living and working conditions of the chemists, programs for improving production, and the materialization of socioeconomic development. The workers and employees of the association pointed out that the chemists' collective is fulfilling its task on almost all technical and economic indices, as well as its contractual obligations.

Comrade Arutyunyan expressed great appreciation for the contribution of the workers and specialists of the association, aiding in the further development of the republic's economy. He said that during these days the chemical plant workers have displayed a professional and nationalistic (?attitude) by continuing to work (?without interruption). He said: Over the years many problems have accumulated, all of which came to a head at once today under the conditions of democratization and glasnost. I am not talking only about the problems of Nagorno-Karabakh. (?We are aware) of the fact that during the 1987 June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee the Armenian SSR Central Committee's leadership was justly viewed within the framework of serious defects in the economic field, and especially in the (?moral-ideological) field. A noteworthy struggle against bribery and favoritism has not been carried out. The necessary (?demands) on cadres do not exist.

All this has naturally had an impact on the people's sentiments and feelings. It is indispensable for us to embark on a decisive struggle against all the lingering negative manifestations. But a normal, businesslike environment is necessary to achieve this. Strikes stifle the normal rhythm and obstruct the work of the unions. Those who do not favor reconstruction are trying, by not respecting the people's sentiments, to exploit the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh to spread mistrust among the population toward the leadership and to create problems for it. What have the strikes given our people? Only great moral and [word indistinct] (?problems).

Arutyunyan then answered various questions from the workers and engineering-technical personnel. The chemists assured the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee that they will do everything to establish a precise labor rhythm and to fulfill their contractual obligations and all planned targets.

Yerevan Party Chief Replaced

PM1407164788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by S. Bablumyan and P. Gutiontov: "Yerevan, 14 July"]

[Text] For the first time this week indications seem to be emerging that the situation in the city is returning to normal. In any event, more Yerevaners turned up for today's morning shift than on past days. The appeals made by prestigious people in Armenia to their fellow citizens have undoubtedly played a part here. The speech on repubican television by Academician V. Ambartsumyan made a great impression in this respect.

But is today really going to mark a turning point? Let's ask well-known writer Levon Mkrtchyan.

"I am probably more aware than other speakers of what kind of words to say to get applause. But it's not applause that we should be seeking right now: That's disgraceful, and it's not the path of flirtation that we need to follow now. We must use all our strength to contribute something useful to our people and hence to all people. I cannot understand the 'personalities' who want to destabilize life in the republic. That isn't the path of struggle but the path to great moral losses."

An organizational plenum of Yerevan party gorkom was held today. L. Saakyan was relived of the duties of first secretary of the party gorkom on his appointment as first deputy chairman of the republic Council of Ministers. M. Minasbekyan, formerly section chief in the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, was elected the new leader of Yerevan's Communists.

Armenian Patriarch Speaks

NC1407165588 Yerevan ARMENPRESS International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 11 Jul 88

[Televised speech by Armenian Patriarch Vazgen I on 7 July]

[Text] Yerevan, 11 July (ARMENPRESS)—Dear people and compatriots: I, the patriarch of all Armenians, again appeal to you from Ejmiatsin at this difficult time.

First, I want to express the regrets of my sad heart to all of you on the sad events of 5 July at Zvartnots International Airport and its environs where, alas, a few dozen of our youths were wounded. I have heard that one of them has died. I pray for his soul and extend my condolences to his mournful family. Also, I deeply regret the fact that there are [word indistinct] among the wounded.

Yes, I lament these unfortunate incidents.

In late February the Armenian population of Karabakh expressed its unanimous wish to join the homeland. That decision is legitimate and constitutional. The Armenians of the Armenian SSR and abroad supported the just expectations of the Karabakh people, with admirable concord and in an orderly manner. For 2 months mass gatherings were held, all of which manifested national unity and orderly behavior, without disrupting our country's normal life in any way, and everyone went to work.

This legal demand reached its [word indistinct] on 15 June when our republic's Supreme Soviet supported the inclusion of Nagorno-Karabakh within the structure of the Armenian SSR and condemned the crimes perpetrated in Sumgait.

Our homeland's government could not have done more than this. However, I strongly believe that we should continue to follow all possible paths for a just solution of the issue, especially since the central supreme organs are seriously determined and want to accelerate a solution of the issue on a constitutional basis and within the framework of friendship between the peoples. This is the [word indistinct] concord that has been created between our compatriots and the government on the issue of Karabakh. However, from now on it will be necessary to sacredly guard this concord, which is the only suitable path toward future success. Mutual respect and trust between the republic's leadership and the people within the framework of law are imperative for true patriotism.

I am proud of our people's orderly display of patriotism within the past few months at Theater Square, where the world has seen the just call of Yerevan's residents. However, with the occupation of the airport and with the recent disorderly acts in Yerevan we lost what we had gained, because it is impossible for us to get anywhere or to solve anything with disorderly and meaningless acts and emotionalism. On the contrary, such acts can only thwart a well-begun effort and throw it off its path toward danger.

I wish to express my satisfaction with the republic's leadership for having acted alertly and vigorously, and I ask that it continue all its efforts until a final and just solution is found on the Karabakh issue.

I also express my satisfaction with the fact that in recent months the Soviet [word indistinct] forces have supported our people's children in various parts of Armenia, in Baku, and in various parts of Azerbaijan—everywhere more than 1 million Armenians are living. Anyone failing to understand this situation will become a victim of uninvited, unwanted, and misguided elements.

It is necessary to revive at any cost the Armenian and Azerbaijani peoples' peaceful coexistence, both in Armenia and Azerbaijan. May we never again see the black years we endured at the turn of the century, when so much blood was shed between the Armenians and Azeris in the Transcaucasus.

God forbid empty acts that threaten our nation's dignity, our people's destiny, our future.

During the past few days I have received telephone calls from abroad from spiritual and national [word indistinct] who urge that I appeal to you and call on you to display foresight and maintain order.

Our homeland—the Armenian SSR—has been continuously following the beneficial path of the nation's just ideals for thousands of years and the heroic struggles of many generations.

If we ignore the value of the rebirth of our country and its safety within the multinational Soviet nation; if we fail to respect our republic and its legitimate leadership; if we do not defend law and order and peaceful development we will not be respecting the memory of those who suffered. We will not be respecting the memory of the 2 million victims of 1915 who closed their eyes in the Dayr al-Zawr desert and could not see the rebirth of our homeland. We will be making our enemies very happy.

I have heard that during recent days some have resorted to extreme antistate and anti-Soviet expressions, the consequences of which could—God forbid—offer Armenia on a platter to our centuries-old enemy. I do not want to believe that such persons exist.

Respected compatriots and friends: Please understand me correctly. Promise to help me through all possible means to close the door to irrational acts. Promise to remain calm, to [word indistinct] devote yourselves to your daily activities in an orderly and responsible manner. Dear students and youths: Continue your studies; prepare yourselves seriously to undertake constructive activities; think of the future, of the development and welfare of our country, and of the fulfillment of the just ideals of our nation.

I would like to recall the words of the great German scholar Goethe, who said that liberty can be gained through legal means. In the Holy Bible the Apostle Peter says that liberty should not be exploited to cover up illegality.

In order to be able to struggle more for our future we have to further strengthen the present, increase our population, improve our country's economy, spread our people's culture, and revive our church's spiritual life by remaining always ready and alert and by seizing every single opportunity that can help us in our struggles.

O Armenian mothers, sisters, brothers, and especially you, the youths: Do not forget the people's and the homeland's lofty interests. Look at Ararat. I appeal to you for the last time with my supplication, with my message. If you do not listen to me—your patriarch—I will curse my destiny and remain silent until eternity.

However, I am confident [word indistinct] that you will [word indistinct]. I pray for all of you. I pray for the safety of the Armenian people. I pray that our reborn homeland will remain firm in the great and strong family of Soviet fraternity. Peace be upon you.

Armenian Poisoning Rumor

PM1507104788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jul 88 Second Edition p 8

[Report by special correspondent S. Oganyan under the "Urgently for the Issue" rubric: "Hot in Masis"]

[Text] Armenian SSR—Situations of diametrically opposite pitch were to be observed today in a small rural rayon in Armenia—Masisskiy Rayon, where a mixed population lives. Since the morning a meeting had been seething on the central square of the rayon center.

Those taking part, about 300 people, were demanding a careful and open study of an incident yesterday involving an elderly married couple, the Nersisyans. Having moved here from Baku literally the day before, these people had been the focus of attention of the entire republic. Here is what A. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the party raykom, had to say: "In our region, in the center of the Ararat valley, July is the hottest month. A temperature of 40 degrees is common here. But for some reason the Nersisyans when they moved did not bring their refrigerator with them—it almost looks as though the reason was that it was a 'Baku' model. This was the reason for their illness: A soup broth prepared the day before had obviously gone bad, which led to what was in fact a quite mild case of poisoning. By the evening the couple had left the hospital, but the rumor started to spread through the rayon. This case is being linked to the dramatic events at the branch of the sewn goods factory when about 50 workers were hospitalized as the result of poisoning for reasons as yet unknown. The incident involving the Nersisyans, which in an ordinary situation would have gone virtually unnoticed, agitated people. They see someone's intrigues in it."

The first secretary had only just intervened in the meeting and had gotten hold of the microphone, not without difficulty, and tried to explain to the gathering the real reasons for the incident. But his words, like the subsequent statements by the doctors and the prosecutor, were greeted with distrust by those present. In my view passions were also heated by the statement from the couple themselves, who stated at the meeting itself that they had doubts about the diagnosis.

It is also hot now on the Dzhraovit village kolkhoz in the same rayon. But the heat here is not determined by passions but by the field toil. I talked with kolkhoz chairman Sh. Yeritsyan. It was a business talk.

"The year has been successful—I am talking about the harvest prospects," Yeritsyan specifies. "It is a long time since we had such a harvest of apricots, potatoes, and tomatoes. Union deliveries have been ensured in full."

Of course, in my talk with the kolkhoz members it was impossible to avoid the subject of Nagorno-Karabakh. They are all attentively following the development of events and discussing with animation the statement made on republican television by Academician V. Ambartsumyan on the eve of his departure for Moscow.

...A few hours later, when we were driving through the rayon center, the square was free of those who had taken part in the meeting. The reinforced patrols were seeking shelter in the shade.

Azerbaijan's Vezirov Interviewed

LD1407164488 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1615 GMT 11 Jul 88

[Interview with A.Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, granted to journalist A.G. Lysenko; date and place not given—live or recorded; carried in a "special edition" of the "View" program, which opens with still of Vezirov, followed by studio interview]

[Text] [Lysenko] Abdul-Rakhman Khalilovich, perhaps my first question is a strange one. When you found out that you were being put forward, (?if we can put it that way), for the post of first secretary of the Central Committee of the republican Communist Party, what were your initial feelings?

[Vezirov] They were made up of two things, one could say. First, of course, a feeling of very great responsibility, and, naturally, an understanding of the trust that was being shown in me. And second, being situated far from my homeland, but reading the newspapers, and being here during my vacation, encountering injustice and things that I did not understand being part of our lives, I sometimes found myself thinking that if I were able, I would probably do it a different way. Well, to be honest, I did not expect so many problems to have built up in those years. And to speak of the main thing, the essence of these problems; there have, after all, always been problems in life, and there always will be. There is no life without this. There can be difficult problems and there can be easy ones, interesting ones and uninteresting ones, necessary and unnecessary ones. If we look at the essence of the problems that have built up in Azerbaijan in particular, many of them have arisen out of the fact that the sense of justice was trampled on—social justice. I have to comment on what we have managed to solve in these past few weeks; in practice we have eliminated what was required without making serious decisions, or expenditure of many millions. We simply said how things should be.

At a meeting in Baku—more than 100,000 people gathered there—I asked for a meeting of the working class of Baku, because we had to hold counsel, say what we were thinking, say what we should now be concentrating our efforts on. The most awesome thing is to prevent abuses of office, of one's work position, because if you do that, if you allow injustice somewhere, then it will be difficult to work. Of course, I also have another principle, I think that the most...[pauses] I fear myself most of all; the harshest judge of me is myself, my own conscience. I must explain to people anything I do, any decision that is made or in which I have participated, and say why I acted the way I did. Perhaps no one will ask me about it, but, whenever I am making a decision, I must explain—to anyone, those above, subordinates, colleagues, going vertically, horizontally, diagonally, or whatever—why I acted the way I did.

[Lysenko] There is no problem in this. For an honest person there is no problem. I have never experienced this, I can tell you this sincerely.

There is a concept—very many people talk about it—of disappointment, the disappointment of a person who has run into injustice, who has lost the fight. It is not by chance that I want to ask this question of you, because I do not think I will be revealing any big secret in saying that you have had battles in your life, battles in which you, for a certain time, suffered defeat, because of injustice and evil. Have you never had a feeling of disappointment? And why does it not arise?

[Vezirov] I do not agree with you. I do not want to sound immodest, but I have not suffered defeat. It it's a battle, it is a battle, and in battle there can be retreats, maneuvering, tactics, and so on, but no, I have not experienced defeat. Defeat, that is if you look at it from the point of view that I was, for example, secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, and then secretary of a big gorkom in the republic, and then head of a Central Commitee department, and that I went abroad as general consul in Calcutta—do you consider that defeat? I don't consider it defeat. Of course, I understand what you want to say, that is, why did I leave Baku—is that right? Because I did not accept what was being done there. I did not accept it because, first, I considered that social justice was being violated, with people saying one thing and doing another, and moreover, they were not embarrassed at the fact that people could see they were saying one thing and doing another. They were not embarrassed at this. There are probably a lot of people thinking: Why did you allow this? I am happy to say that I have nothing to be ashamed of in what I have done. I'll meet anybody, including you—we worked together in the (?native) Komsomol—I am not embarrassed at meeting anybody. One must live honestly. The point is not what post you occupy. I think that you will agree with me if I say that today we embraced each other in just the same way we did when I occupied quite different posts.

[Lysenko] Yes, absolutely.

[Vezirov] It isn't the point. Any person should...[pauses] I think that probably this is very important, that all our people, regardless of what post they occupy, should stay the same as they are. And I want to tell you sincerely—you can see how Mikhail Sergeyevich behaves—I tell you: This person does not change at all. So, people must strive so that if they are given a major post, then it is only because they have been open and sincere, because others, once they take up a post, begin to lose what they were appreciated for, what they were entrusted with their post for, and an incredible catastrophe results, an incredible catastrophe. And then a year or two later one wonders why this person becomes unbearable to others. Meanwhile, he holds on, he sits there, and time passes. Everyone must be answerable; you are occupying a lofty post, such trust has been shown in you, and you must give your all, all that you have. If you can't then do something else. Don't shame the post you occupy and the cause of the party, because it is by what the first secretary does, what the raykom does, that our party is judged.

[Lysenko] In connection with this, I remember, about 2 years ago, visiting Baku, we looked around the town, we were shown one fine building, and a second, absolutely beautiful. You can imagine it, our eyes opened wide. Later I saw one of these buildings in the "Vremya" program, and saw that it had been put to uses other than what it was built for. That also comes into the whole concept of social justice, when everyone knows everything, yet everyone seems to keep quiet.

[Vezirov] The house was built for prominent guests—guests who in general rarely come to Baku. Perhaps—I reason thus: Why not a fine house, why not receive guests in a good house. The Azerbaijani people are very generous. I'll tell you something interesting. The Azerbaijani people have a custom: a visitor arrives at a rural house, and there the best room, the very best room, better decorated than all the rest, is always locked; it is for the guest. For us, a guest is the dearest person, we will give everything to a guest. I could understand it were it not for Baku having a disgraceful housing situation. Not just a dozen, but perhaps several hundreds of thousands of people are in need. They live in incredibly difficult conditions. These people, whose roofs leak, who do not have drinking water, see this house locked up, and know why it was built, and how much was invested in it...[changes thought] You know, when I arrived, literally on the day when we handed the building over as a wedding palace, it was only then that I went there. I felt ashamed, because before that I had visited places where people live. I visited them and met and talked with them. I saw tears, I saw the children, the conditions they were living in, and that is why we have now decided that we will engage very seriously in the housing program. Moreover, we have said this: We have taken very big pledges upon ourselves. But there is no other way. Either we must work, or we must admit to being helpless. We have said it is not just square meters that we need; we need apartments with telephones, hot water, good drinking water. And elsewhere there must be kindergartens, shops, roads.

We have now embarked on forming special detachments to prepare sites for future housing construction. There will be roads, and it will be organized so that the telephone workers don't dig up the asphalt afterwards, so the sewage workers don't dig it up, and the drinking water and lights aren't put in later. We want to create something like that. We are putting it up for nationwide discussion, so that the people can see everything and what it is for. We will make our decision at a plenum. We will publish all this, and moreover, we will be responsible, we will let the people keep a check on all this. We want the people to take part in this. Let it be truly nationwide—the discussion, the adoption of decisions, and also participation in everything.

We want to engage earnestly in intensifying animal husbandry, so as not to bring everything in from other republics. At the moment, a lot of produce is brought in to Azerbaijan. Probably these economic ties will remain, but we want there to be a lighter burden on our state.

On the 2d day at my post I received a letter from our health minister, Yevgeniy Ivanovich Chazov, a new highly respected man. He had written long before to the former secretary; this letter came my way by chance. I will tell you frankly, I was very upset; there were two pages of figures, difficult to read. Our republic occupies a disgraceful place for infant mortality; it turns out that many of our women do not even have the opportunity to give birth in the hospital or in a maternity home.

Then we had the idea: we have an 8-hectare complex in the town; there is a fine garden with peaches and apricots, there are big houses, and a huge swimming pool, built so that some leading nucleus, so to say—well, four people, the leadership, yes, the leadership, well, if they felt like it, then everyone could bathe there, but they did not let everyone in sometimes, even if (?you bribed them)—anyway, there is a sauna, a gymnasium, everything with fine equipment, everything is first class, foreign, and so on. We handed it all over to Comrade Likhanov—also a former Komsomol worker, the chairman of the children's fund—to the Ministry of Health, and now it is a children's health center.

You know, the idea has taken off. I have been there and I saw a big 11-storey building. They said that in 6 months it would be an administrative building; the administration would be transferred to it from this works. [as heard] I said: Comrades, perhaps you could use the telephone and receive people in this same old room—let's hand it over for a children's hospital. They decided. There was a second, a third; now we have several dozen, including guest houses. Of late they have built so many of these guest houses in the rayons, and now everywhere there is a sort of competition. I have said to some of the secretaries: you know, you don't have to follow suit; perhaps in your rayon the building would make a third school shift unnecessary; perhaps it is needed because there is no club, so hand it over as a club.

So there will be this third area, the area of concern for the health of our people. There are very many complaints about injustice. There has also been corruption there, you understand? Unfortunately, sometimes people have to pay for operations, and for other things; you just cannot understand it.

There is another thing I would like to say in connection with this. You know, 17 years ago it was decided in our republic not to give people dachas; many resolutions were issued about horticultural associations, but nothing was done. You only had to telephone, and say: Comrade, let's cancel this, we have gathered and discussed it, all the comrades have given their support, and the decision was abolished. There were many thousands of calls, people saying, well, if we get a dacha or not, that is another issue, but we could see social injustice, because they were cancelling, excluding people's chance of a dacha—and it's hot in Baku—somewhere to rest, to have a swim, to grow some produce, for yourself and for your neighbor, and so on. I was shown calculations; I am no specialist, but what they gave me said that thanks to this, 700,000 Baku residents will spend the summer on their plot, at their dachas. The main thing is that all this was becoming neglected; the houses were crumbling, the land had become unusable. That is the problem of social injustice; people say we could be reconciled to this if they didn't have dachas themselves, both in summer and in winter. Hou could this be? We have to restore social justice. And I am very happy.

You know, I have also been a conference delegate, and in the presidium I listened very carefully to all the speeches, the reaction in the hall. You know, when I was a Komsomol Central Committee secretary I was invited to [word indistinct] events; there was not a single written note to which the presidium did not respond to at once and take advice on. Decisions were adopted on many of them right there. That's work, and they have never composed some document or other.

I am saying nothing about the applause—that is, perhaps they might clap once, or twice, or clap tempestuously, or just clap as though to say, if you are giving a bad speech that's enough. It's a living organism, not overorganized. And how was it before?—We have a proposal, let us take it as the basis. No remarks. And how many were there from our delegation? We were talking about them yesterday, how many suggestions they drafted and passed on. The commissions are taking it all into account. Well, that is collective work, collective reason.

Mikhail Sergeyevich delivered the report. Notes arrived, delegates came up and said: I didn't understand what he said yesterday. We agreed in the commission, and he spoke today, and explained all this. When have you ever seen something being explained, and an attempt to find the people's views? That too is a guarantee if irreversibility. That is the main task of this reform of the political system. It may acquire various forms, and so on; it will probably be constantly improved, because the task will change, the requirements will change, and so on. But the most important thing is to pursue this, to really involve the people in government, in all spheres, not in words, as things were always proclaimed before, but in deed. This, I think, is, as it happens, the reason why it was really worth convening such a conference.

You could hear from a lot of speakers a fine word: fateful. I think that is an accurate description; we will indeed tackle the issue and settle the fate of the country's future, the fate of restructuring, and in this connection it was very rightly said in the speeches—I also spoke of this—that it is only through strengthening the leading role of our party that we will be able to justify the hopes and expectations of our peoples.

As I told you, we announced the telephone numbers of all leaders. I telephoned one comrade and asked for him. I decided that this must be wrong. Many people phone me, sometimes until 2 o'clock in the morning. If I'm busy someone takes down a caller's telephone number. But sometimes no one can get through to anyone. I opened the directory of leading officials and put in a call. I said I wanted to talk to the head of a department of the Central Committee. They told me he was at a conference. I asked when I could phone. He won't be in today. Tomorrow there's a Supreme Soviet session. I said it was a very urgent matter. Then write a letter. When we get the letter we'll have a look, and so on.

Of course, I immediately gathered all the Central Committee departmental heads. I said who it was that I had telephoned, because it's not the girl who answered the phone who's to blame over this; she was very polite when she was talking to me and I pointed that out. She did everything very well. But I did not achieve what I was wanting, and we published this in the press. Before that I was at our industrial institute, the Petrochemicals Institute—of which I am a graduate—and I stated from the platform; note my number, and if you need to give me a call, you're welcome. You know, I usually call them some time after 2300—maybe as late as 0100 or 0130—and I apologize for calling so late because I don't have any other time. But it's enough for people just to hear the voice, and their questions go away.

[Lysenko] The important thing is that they've heard it.

[Vezirov] It's important for people. They say, given that you've picked up the phone, and so on, you'll attend to the questions that worry and disturb us. Perhaps it's worth repeating again, perhaps it's only a detail. What I have observed in this, is not just a lack of desire on the part of our people to pick up the phone, but that they are simply incapable of holding a conversation, a dialogue. They're not used to it: everything used to come from above. But when it comes to listening...[pauses] I came across an interesting little book, written by Americans for businessmen. It was called: "I'm Listening." It is very important for you to listen to people. Sometimes all a person's problems disappear if you listen to him. He wants to speak his mind. And if he gains your attention he can get rid of a lot of his questions.

[Lysenko] But take young people. They are in the most difficult situation. What can be done?

[Vezirov] In my speech,—I don't want to repeat my speech, it was broadcast on television and was printed in full in the press—I said that the distortions we have had in many areas, particularly in the development of the economy and the social sphere, even today affect our young people in a very serious way, a very serious way. In it I gave the following information: We have 250,000 members of our population capable of work who are not engaged in public-sector production. Perhaps I would not even have said this, but I said it for the following reason: Because the number of young people in this category is growing. They've usually said: Well, who are they, these 250,000—they're housewives. But you know, they're the young people. What are we raising these people to be, with their casual earnings, with no one paying any attention to them? Society pays no attention to them. But we demand that they take up some place in society, so there is disappointment, and so forth. Unfortunately, when I addressed that meeting of at least 100,000 people, there was a very large number of young people there. There were a lot of adults there too, but there were a lot of young people. Unfortunately, in many of these processions and meetings they were the most undisciplined and unwilling to listen. This is a problem. In other words, the people addressing them were apparently of a kind they did not want to listen to.

A cartoon by a Hungarian artist made a very strong impression on me. This is the situation. Sitting in the audience are some very inquisitive individuals. They are all looking into the face of the speaker, and in their heads, each of them has a light bulb—and they are being addressed by a speaker who has in his head an oil lamp.

If you're going to speak to a meeting of young people who have 100-watt or even brighter light bulbs burning in their heads, then anyone wanting to teach them should have a laser or even a computer in his head. You understand? And he had an oil lamp!

Our approach hasn't been a serious one. On the one hand, flurried whispers; then: Come on boys, come on kids, tell everyone everything's fine. Our young people are active, clever, good. Our young people are excellent. Our work with them has been poor. In our Komsomol in Azerbaijan, one citizen in six in the republic is a Komsomol member. We have talked to the secretary and the first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee about the thoughts and the ideas they have. We arranged to meet without fail once a certain amount of time has gone by: Whenever I've come back from being away I've always stopped off at the Komsomol Central Committee and met them there. I want to discuss with them the way we should be working.

Comrade Alekperov told me that many secretaries of Komsomol organizations have been replaced. Even in faculties people have occupied posts for years on end. It's been the same in factories. Sometimes they say: What are you complaining about? You get your pay—go and do your job. We've lost something. Perhaps it's a petty matter, perhaps it isn't the most important issue, although in life, I believe, there's no such thing as a petty issue: There's a petty approach, a superficial approach, but any question that arises requires a careful and respectful attitude and solution. Without fail we are going to think about how best we can operate, about the program we are going to offer our young people.

[Lysenko] Rakhman Khalilovich, no doubt it would be dishonest on my part were I not to ask you a question that is probably one of the most complex at the present time, the question of relations between the nationalities. Sumgait. These events essentially produced an effect the same as Chernobyl throughout the country. As I understand it, this is the most acute issue in your republic.

[Vezirov] Of course, it was a tragedy. It was a tragedy. I couldn't imagine the scale of it. Indeed, I said in my speech at the party conference that we are going to investigate its source, will sort it out without fail, and will make a party assessment of what happened. First, those who brought about that kind of situation have to be made to answer, but the main thing is that it must not be allowed to reoccur. Unfortunately, there has been a lack of principle shown by leading organizations, including, and in the first place, party organizations. I cannot agree that no one saw this. They saw it. And not just for 1 year. But they pretended. Working, you see, is more complicated than pretending that this problem does not exist. It was driven inside. In fact, people's feelings were injured, those of Azerbaijanis and Armenians.

In actual fact, things were conducted in such a way that interests were encroached upon. What do they say, for example? Why can't we see Yerevan television in Nagorno-Karabakh, where many people speak Armenian, including Azerbaijanis. I myself come from Nagorno-Karabakh. I knew the Armenian language well, and sometimes when we are talking I remember many Armenian words, and I am able to speak it. Why must they not listen to Yerevan? It's the capital of a fraternal union republic. On the other hand there are very many Azerbaijanis living in that same oblast—about 25 percent—and there is no oblast newspaper in the Azerbaijani language. This area is encroached upon, too. And another. Why? Haven't we got the paper? Haven't we got the radio relay facilities? There's no attention!

I get asked a lot of questions. Who benefits from this? I am able to say this: It's not to the benefit, it's to the great misfortune of our two peoples, and the peoples of our country, when things like that arise. It's to their detriment. To their benefit, you know, is the fact that restructuring is proceeding, for it has roused such strata, it has brought to life such tools that when we talk about restructuring being irreversible...[pauses] what do we mean by the irreversibility of restructuring?—Not going back to the things we want to get away from, stagnation, social injustice, and so on, ignoring the interests of the people.

It is possible to name forces that do not want restructuring, who want to make the term antirestructuring forces understandable. But who are they? We are coming to the conclusion—and on this we have formulated this conclusion—that these really are corrupted clans, businessmen active in the shadow economy, who have knitted themselves together with criminal elements and who work close together with them, because there are a lot of these people among those whom we have brought to account for the disturbances. They want to destabilize the situaton by means of sowing discord so as to prevent us from dealing with this question.

Do you know how much of my time goes into this? A very great deal of my time. We spend a lot of time on these matters instead of dealing with the things I've mentioned, instead of dealing with the problems of young people; instead of developing our livestock farming; instead of building housing; instead of dealing with public health; instead of our young people's problems. And this is in the interests of precisely those forces. We will find the strength. It's not just that we're not going to retreat; we are going to advance, we've declared war on them all in the name of the interests of our people.

I would like to say that it all started in Nagorno-Karabakh with a lot of economic and social problems, but we've now worked them out. A very strong decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers was adopted in order to solve these questions. If a problem has arisen it has to be solved, and solved in an unbelievably prompt way, generously, and at the proper time. All this was done.

Here you are, I'll show you. By the way, I arrived, when I started... [pauses] on the 1st day I took this document, and I was convinced that they had not started on its practical implementation. But in literally 7 or 8 days—I'll read this, here are cuttings from the papers. This is what was done. For example, this was published under the heading: "Behind the Words of the CPSU Central Committee and Council of Ministers' Decision—Specialists for Nagorno- Karabakh." I could read it to you and show how many issues were resolved—even more than were posed, in order to train cadres for this... [pauses] they were trained, they had their own (?studios), and so on. That is the first one. And then, we had the Armenian drama theater visit us in Baku, it was a good theater, I remember going to see it as a child, because in the neighborhood where I grew up there were Armenians, and I... [pauses] well, we used to go and see, I knew this theater. We are now opening this theater. It's not that we are sending people to the Yerevan State Artistic Theater Institute for training, from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast as well—let them go there, and when they come back we'll form this theater and open it. "Stepanakert on the Air" is what this headline says. We have formed our own television center in the oblast center. They transmit their own news and programs several hours a day. "Printing House Capacities of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Being Expanded"—that's not just newspapers, it is books; textbooks, whatever you like, carry on!

[Lysenko] Can one hope that the issue of the (?separations) will be solved quickly?

[Vezirov] To say quickly is to be naive, because a lot of trouble has been caused, much trouble has been caused. What we need here is a lot of very careful work. But first, of course, what we need is for the appeal from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, which came at just the right time, calling for a balanced, sober, commonsense... [pauses] We figure that all these issues must be examined in very great detail. It is such a delicate, incredibly sensitive issue that one must study it very seriously. And we must not make any mistake, we must not be hasty. But we have just one aim—I spoke about this at the party conference—expressing the opinion of our entire party organization: We must do everything possible in order to prevent the destruction of what has united and will always unite our two peoples.

But we must not be sparing with our time, our hearts, or our minds in this. I think that one day we will meet here again and talk about the dark night having passed. We must leave the night behind us and tackle the issue calmly. There is no reason to divide our Soviet land.

I was so pleased with the words in the report, and they will probably be in the resolution on interethnic issues: Any Soviet person, whatever his nationality, must feel at home at any place in the Soviet Union. That is the main aim our party will try to resolve. You will have noted the attention that was devoted to this issue in the report. It is very important that the party Central Committee does not try to sweep this under the carpet, with some half-truth; we need the truth, and what is more, vigorous work, maximum of work, directed toward preventing developments in a bad (?direction). I think, perhaps—I don't want to exaggerate—I have the impression that we have put the brakes on a little, and we are heding toward, so to say, halting it, and then moving in the right direction.

Paper Cites Ukrainian Nationalists' Demand

PM1507100188 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jul 88 p 4

[Article by "our correspondent" V. Panov: "Good Old Makar's Stories"]

[Text] These are heated times. You can feel it at meetings and gatherings being held throughout the country for various reasons. People's feelings have been boiling over. Everyone wants restructuring to advance as rapidly and as well as possible. And there is enough cleansing work for everyone. But it must be done intelligently.

Many historical monuments are in need of the assistance of the Lvov restoration workers. If we are to believe the official claim of the organizing body, the meeting of many thousands of people on the evening of 7 July was devoted to their conservation and the creation of new monuments, in particular to T.G. Shevchenko and the victims of the repressions of the time of the personality cult.

Initially this was the case. People had gathered earlier than scheduled, it is true, and, having gained general agreement, Viktoriya Andreyeva, a member of the organizing body and a journalist with the oblast youth newspaper LENINSKAYA MOLOD, opened the meeting. A general, businesslike, constructive talk was initiated. After all, neither the restoration workers, nor the construction workers, nor the informal associations worried about the problem of preserving Lvov's architectural monuments can do without the aid of all citizens.

But this development of events clearly did not suit Ivan Makar, a young engineer at the special design and technology bureau of one of Lvov's scientific research institutes and a member of the organizing body, who had come to the meeting, and a group of formerly convicted "rights defenders" some of whom recently attended President Reagan's reception in Moscow. They included V. Chernovol (that is the correct spelling of his name), already known to our readers and one of the leaders of the so-called "Ukrainian Herald," connected with the foreign subversive Association of Ukrainian Nationalists center. Angry that they had "dared" to open the meeting without waiting for him, Makar, to approving whistles and shouts from several groups of young people in the crowd, arbitrarily repealed the start of the meeting and began it according to his own scenario. For her "offense" Andreyeva was removed from the organizing body.

What were the demands of Ivan Makar—only recently a petty demagogue but now someone who actively claims the role of popular tribune and popular hero—and the "rights defenders" who came with him? It turns out that they are demanding the perpetuation of the memory of the Bandera supporters—members of the organization of Ukrainian nationalists. In addition, if the city authorities do not heed their voice, the newfound "good old boys" threatened a strike and street riots. Makar, who has definitively entered into the role of popular leader, even used every artistic effect to urge the gathering to such a strike. Nothing surprising about that. At his main place of work the young engineer's labor successes are not brilliant, he is obviously impeded by the burden of being a tribune and of his thoughts on the topic of "how Makar saved the Ukraine." Indeed, preparing demonstrations, strikes, and other "big" matters is no joke. It also requires time, you know.

Only for the entire Ukrainian people, not a small group of loudmouths, it is not easy to forget the crimes of the Bandera supporters who were in the service of German fascism and fiercely hated their own and foreign peoples. It was not for nothing that the gestapo fed the leaders of the nationalists and their agents—Melnik, Bandera, and others. They were prepared to inundate the Ukraine in blood for every morsel of bread, for every cigarette from their "masters." They have on their hands the blood of hundreds of thousands of civilians: men, women, and children. Ukrainians, Russians, Jews, Poles. They destroyed the Lvov ghetto and others and the Soviet POW camps, razed Polish villages, and killed frontline soldiers. Many tens of thousands of the best sons and daughters of the Ukrainian people, Soviet activists, and young teachers and Komsomol members died at their hands. It is a rare west Ukrainian village that has no such sorrowful tomb. The Bandera supporters helped the fascists to take away into captivity the flower of the nation—hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian boys and girls, many of whom never returned. They also have on their conscience the blood of the Ukrainian boys deceived into joining the so-called Ukrainian "Galitchina" SS division, utterly defeated by the Soviet Army at Brody.

Yes, among the Bandera supporters there were people duped by the high-flown nationalist demagoguery. To be honest, I am sorry for them. But the Soviet authorities have declared an amnesty. Many of them took advantage of it. But we truly did not stand on ceremony with the killers and their accomplices. Of course, here too there were abuses and excesses. But does that give grounds for whitewashing the entire Association of Ukrainian Nationalists-UPO [expansion unknown]? Under no circumstances! As a rule the Bandera terrorists received their just deserts.

That is why it is perfectly incomprehensible how the idea of defending restructuring declared at the meeting can be combined with the vindication of the bandits and murderers. Somehow this does not fit in, to put it mildly, with the slogans of restructuring.... But it is entirely capable of compromising the very idea of restructuring.

They are descending to a frenzy unworthy of a man, citizen, and patriot. But sooner or later they will have to recall, perhaps not without shame, what they have said and done.

Yakovlev Addresses Central Mass Media Forum

PM1407125388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jul 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Embarking on the Matter Without Delay"]

[Text] A conference of leaders of the central mass media and workers of science and culture has been held at the CPSU Central Committee. A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed those taking part in the conference. He said in particular:

The social scale and political weight of the 19th all-union party conference are obvious. M.S. Gorbachev's report and the conference decisions expand and deepen the front of restructuring and lay a firm democratic basis for the irreversibility of qualitatively new social processes of a transforming socialist nature.

The conference showed that society and the party from top to bottom are now experiencing a special and positive upheaval generated by the sharp change in the entire situation in the country. I stress that it is not a spontaneous and not an adverse change but a change generated by the choice made by the party itself in favor of restructuring. But it is a very rapid, intensive, and profound change. You have to see and understand that much through which we are passing today has in all respects been generated by the very depth and dynamism of the changes.

These are inevitable and good changes. This is a time for honest quest, for sincere doubts, and sometimes for errors too. That is a feature of any revolution, that is the specific nature of the moment we are experiencing. And our main task now is to protect society from dangerous onslaughts of extremism from any side, without giving up one iota of the glasnost and openness achieved, without reducing by a single step the pace of democratization and restructuring itself, and to display restraint and revolutionary resolve.

The conference has laid the foundation to a fundamental reform of the political system aimed at ensuring full power of the people and placing new organizational structures beneath it. The party itself is also reforming itself in conformity with its role as the political vanguard of restructuring and society. The conference firmly formulated the provision on the primacy of the law in all spheres of life and on the development of the socialist legal state and the assertion of the unconditional equality of all before the law.

The 3 years since the April plenum have convincingly shown that the mechanism delaying restructuring will operate until we succeed in overcoming social apathy, parasitism, excessive statification of public life, and excessive administration as the prevailing method of management. The structures we have inherited will continue to be authoritarian in mollycoddling enterprising people, to flout democratic institutions, and to halt economic reform. And it is the ossified structures of management which are holding up restructuring today.

The conference's most important policy-forming factor was its open and innovative spirit and nature—in terms of the depth of the questions posed, in terms of the purport and content of its decisions, in terms of the way it proceeded and the way in which it was covered, in terms of the influence of all this on people's consciousness and on theoretical thinking, and finally in terms of the opportunities that will be opened up before the country by the implementation of its decisions and program.

The decisions made by the conference will lead our society to a qualitatively new level of socialist renewal in all spheres of life. Restructuring has been powerfully accelerated and will further develop to a considerable extent on its own sociopolitical basis.

The conference took a further step in the overall intellectualization of approaches toward the solution of urgent problems and stressed once more clearly and categorically that without a fundamental increase in knowledge and a new understanding of the role of science and culture in human development restructuring will not produce the necessary return. Soulless development cannot be socialist development. That is why at the restructuring stage of social development socialism is acutely in need of a heightened social sensitivity on the part of the intelligentsia, of its artistic and scientific breakthroughs, and of its profound revelations of the human spirit.

The conference is essentially a new leap in the development of political thinking, democratic practice, and glasnost. Accomplishing a revolution is a complex matter both in theory and in practice. It was clear beforehand that not everyone would have sufficient conviction, endurance, and character to firmly go the distance measured off by the realities of the time. And there will continue to be those who will turn away from restructuring when their personal comfort clashes with the principle of social justice, when their spiritual comfort clashes with the necessary breaking of obsolete ideas. The bad habit of clutching at the administrative lever will live for a long while yet.

But the revolution taking place in consciousness is accompanied not only by the ascent toward truth and the quest for constructive ideas, by sober, albeit merciless, assessments of the errors and tragedies of the distant and recent past, assessments pervaded with anguish and compassion for what was experienced. The shift in consciousness toward democratic thinking and genuine moral socialist values has unfortunately as it were also shed light on the petit bourgeois mentality dictated by individualism, egocentrism, and banal egotism. When all this has the nature of individual lack of culture and disregard for the interests of other people, then it is a matter of education. But attempts to kindle emotions, to heat passions, to sow national or social suspicion, and to cause different social groups to collide scarcely fit into the process of democratization. Using glasnost as cover for this is blasphemous to say the least.

The conference raised the threshold of responsibility, and considerably at that—above all in assessing the existing situation and the progress of restructuring and in setting tasks. M.S. Gorbachev's report and the delegates' speeches rightly stressed that however grave the legacy bequeathed to us, it is time to take responsibility and to analyze how we are working ourselves. The assessment of the first 3 years of restructuring given at the conference was a very tough one. It also obliges us to take an exacting look at the activity of the mass media.

The conference keenly gave priority to the main political question: Henceforth restructuring will be judged by the solution of urgent practical tasks. That includes food, housing, consumer goods, and the introduction of elementary order in all spheres. Restructuring is life itself, in which there are no trivial matters. It is possible to restructure management structures, to become even more critical, to hold free debates, but unless daily living in the countryside, the city, and the labor collective changes markedly, real restructuring will be delayed.

Glasnost must work with redoubled results on all salients. Its assertion in our life has helped to elaborate and to begin to implement a truly nationwide program of moral and political normalization. And the party conference's instructions in this respect are absolutely uncompromising: Without glasnost there is no restructuring, no democracy.

We urgently need a mechanism for the sensible, legal, dynamic coordination of all legitimate interests existing in society—the coordination, not the sacrificing of some interests to others, and a dynamic coordination that would consider the constantly changing social realities and would not give rise to the "sacred cows" of dogmatism. Glasnost is also the cornerstone of this mechanism, the most important principle of its structure and operation. The press is one of the means of its implementation.

In the activity of the mass media, A.N. Yakovlev stressed, it is now essential to move to a new qualitative level of work and to resolutely raise responsibility. There must be criticism, but specific, convincing criticism, not criticism that diminishes but criticism that heals. There must be complaints, but reasoned ones. There must be glasnost, but glasnost for all. The broadest comparison of opinions. A specific, analytic, in-depth approach must come to the fore. The talent and competence, initiative and passion of the printed word—everything must go on the altar of the cause.

The top priority today is the implementation of the Food Program. There is one solution: ensuring that the conference's instructions regarding the agrarian policy are now introduced everywhere and immediately. Prejudices against the contract, against leasing, and against cooperatives continue to be widespread. We must above all break down the dogmatic barriers in the consciousness not only of leaders but also of some strata of the population. The newspaper page should focus on the work of the party committees in expanding the autonomy of forms and disseminating new forms of labor organization and on the assertion of the course toward self-sufficiency in food and the struggle against parasitism. The party committees' task is to ease the lot of and to provide assistance for the trail blazers of restructuring in the countryside; to remove obstacles, traps, and artificial impediments from their path.

Comrade A.N. Yakovlev dwelled then on the fact that in the process of restructuring and the implementation of economic and political reform it is not only rights but also obligations and responsibility for the real state of affairs in all spheres, above all with direct regard to man, which are being transferred to the localities. And there must be an increase in the demand made on the ability and wish to use power to benefit people, on the combination of local interests with statewide interests and discipline as a whole. Respect for the organ of power and the masses' effective democratic control over it—that is the formula for political reform. Glasnost now, in addition to all its other tasks, must resolutely promote the establishment of an updated political system and its putting to work at full strength.

The all-union party conference put on the agenda the task of creating a truly legal state and implementing a reform of the court and legal system to this end. It is the duty of the press, television, and radio to instill respect for the law and the observance of state discipline and equally to seek to ensure that the law effectively protects the constitutional rights and dignity of citizens and democratic institutions.

The mass media rightly criticize all kinds of deviations from the law by officials and official institutions and organizations. But sometimes this criticism is conducted in such a way that many people form the false impression that the main thing is to oppose established demands everywhere and in everything and to regard them in all cases as inert and obsolete and the organs of power and law and order standing guard over the law as the veritable embodiment of the suppression of rights and freedoms. This position corrupts public consciousness and cultivates legal nihilism, not to mention the fact that it is extremely one-sided. The law, while it operates, should be fulfilled by all without exception and unconditionally—nothing else is allowed. And punishment for violating the law should follow just as unconditionally. The press, if it is really democratic, should stand firmly and convincingly on the side of legislation and discipline.

Restructuring is revolution. But no revolution is programmed unfailingly for success, for its most untroubled progress. The press' social responsibility in that sense consists not merely in words and wishes. It is one of the main demands of restructuring. The times call for boldness and also create the opportunities and the incentives for its manifestation. But society needs real, not simulated boldness—boldness in setting problems and in approaching their solution, boldness in defending everything advanced, progressive, honest, and seemly, especially when it is incapable of defending itself.

We have begun, without noticing it ourselves, a very profound shift of historical importance. The goal has been set of elevating all that is best in man. This today determines not only man's progress but also his very survival. You cannot do without boldness and courage here. And we should render their due to those who display it and do not simulate it. Let's distinguish in our deeds between the courageous, conscious boldness of the soldier who goes into battle with open eyes and a clear purpose and the mindless, pointless boldness of the small boy who hangs on to the footboard of a train car or runs across the street in front of an automobile.

A demand was heard from the conference platform regarding the need for the most painstaking check of all facts in publications, especially in items of a keen critical bent.

The cost of untruth in the press is incurred not only by the author and editor. It is incurred by the good cause for which journalists come out and it benefits those whom they criticize. It is also incurred by restructuring.

As in restructuring as a whole, the mass media items, whatever questions they touch on, must contain realism in setting tasks and putting forward specific demands and proposals. Approaches from unrealistic, maximalist positions are a very dangerous form of social parasitism.

The practical expression of the mass media's social responsibility is the depth and analytical approach of items and the far greater level of scientificness than before in thinking and in posing problems. Let's take one question, a most painful one for us—the struggle against bureaucracy. Too often we still confuse it with the struggle against a specific bureaucrat. Yet both struggles are needed, but above all the former—to a far greater degree.

Sometimes, instead of penetrating deep to the essence of clashes and processes in life, lack of emotional restraint and loud phrases dominate on the pages of newspapers and in broadcasts. When a particular shortcoming is being exposed it is not reason, not common sense that prevails, but a position of troublemaking that reduces to nothing the best impulses, devalues the printed words, causes irritation, and harms glasnost and restructuring.

In brief, today the press must not record but study phenomena both in the totality of their features and within a specific section of time. A kind of social probe of post-April practice is required.

Let's subject the new processes to an attentive and committed analysis. And without overpraising what is new, let's investigate specifically how the practice of restructuring is working in various parts of the country. What and who is impeding the new? And what, even among what is newest, is in need of correction.

Restructuring needs patriotism with a capital P—socialist patriotism, which stands firmly on the soil of knowledge, reality, and practical deeds and is measured by the results of these deeds. Restructuring is inconceivable without pride in yesterday and today—selective and open-eyed pride. Restructuring is not destruction. We cannot live on ruins. It is in man's nature to build. Restructuring is sensible, intelligent movement forward based on common sense and respect for real, living people.

The promotion of the ideas of the 19th all-union party conference and the struggle for their triumph not only in principle but also in each specific case and for the ensuring of the unity of word and deed—that is what defines the role of the mass media at the present stage.

Dobrynin Addresses Activists Academy Graduates

PM1407133588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Jul 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Graduation Ceremony"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting devoted to the graduation of the latest group of students—activists of communist, workers, and revolutionary democratic parties and liberation movements—was held at the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Social Sciences 8 July. Those present were addressed by A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

You have been in Moscow at a special time, he said. Your course of study here coincided with the beginning of the process of revolutionary restructuring which has encompassed the whole of Soviet society—its economy, its political system, and its ideology.

The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference ended a week ago. It was truly a watershed event which in terms of its historic significance exceeded even many of our party congresses. A new stage in the life of the country, a new stage in the development of socialist sociopolitical relations has been initiated. The debate on M.S. Gorbachev's report, which was truly free, democratic, and Leninist in character, yielded a tremendous wealth of ideas, views, and specific proposals that reflect the opinions and interests of all the classes and social groups of Soviet society.

The main result of the conference is that a policy program position has been elaborated on the most vital problems of our further development. The question of the role of the party as the political vanguard, as the political force directing restructuring was at the focus of attention at the conference.

And immediately, without procrastination, hot on the heels of the conference, as they say, the party has embarked on the implementation of the conference decisions. At the end of this month a CPSU Central Committee Plenum will be held to discuss questions of the practical implementation of the measures outlined in the conference documents and the proposals and suggestions put forward by the delegates. In the fall of this year, at the next session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, draft legislative acts on the restructuring of soviet organs and necessary addenda and amendments to the USSR Constitution are to be discussed. And a congress of people's deputies and the formation at this congress of new organs of state power is scheduled for April next year.

The interconnection between socialism and democracy, the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed, is, without exaggeration, one of the fundamental questions of present-day world development and the entire international revolutionary movement. The democratic remodeling of our political system proceeds by no means from the criteria of so-called Western democracy. It is a necessary stage of the development of socialist democracy, the democracy of the working people. It was for the sake of this kind of democracy that our people carried out the great social revolution in 1917, built the socialist society at the cost of tremendous effort and sacrifices, and defended it in the most difficult war in human history.

We will not depart an inch from socialism and its deep foundations laid by generations of Soviet people. Neither our friends nor our enemies should entertain any doubts or illusions on this account. But at the same time we resolutely renounce the dogmatic, bureaucratic, and voluntarist heritage because it has nothing in common either with Marxism-Leninism or genuine socialism. Life has confirmed that even under the conditions of a one-party system real pluralism of views, glasnost, and freedom of expression and criticism are possible and necessary.

Radical democratic renewal now represents the decisive link in the chain of transformations which are called upon to ensure the full development of the humane nature and creative might of socialism.

Although domestic problems were at the focus of attention at the conference, A.F. Dobrynin said further, questions of international politics were also discussed. And this is natural. The cardinal changes in our own home have, naturally, made it necessary to adopt new approaches to international issues too. A.F. Dobrynin spoke about the underestimation in the past of political possibilities for ensuring security and easing tension, as a result of which we allowed ourselves to be drawn into the arms race. If we had not broken with the logic of this kind of development, we might have found ourselves on the brink of a military confrontation. This is why there was a need for not merely an improvement but a resolute renewal of our foreign policy work on the basis of the new thinking, the foundations of which were laid by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress.

As was stressed at the party conference, the results of the 3 years of restructuring enable us to claim—and this is an important result—that it has been possible to push back the threat of war between the nuclear powers. The axis of international life has begun to shift from confrontation to cooperation and mutual understanding.

The correctness of this conclusion is borne out by the following facts:

The first agreement in history on the destruction of two classes of nuclear weapons has been concluded; there are realistic prospects of a 50-percent reduction in the strategic nuclear arsenals of the United States and the USSR, the limitation and subsequent ending of nuclear tests, the elimination of chemical weapons, and a substantial reduction in armed forces and armaments in Europe;

International agreements have been signed on the settlement of one of the acute regional conflicts—the conflict around Afghanistan;

The development of restructuring has contributed to a qualitative change for the better in our relations with the United States; the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow represented another step in the development of dialogue between the USSR and the United States;

Our relations with West European countries are developing on a bilateral and a multilateral basis, and so are relations between CEMA and the European Community;

The role of the Nonaligned Movement in international politics is growing; a restructuring of relations in Asia and the Pacific region is taking place, albeit more slowly than we might wish; the concept of international economic security and the interconnection between the problems of disarmament and development are increasingly gaining recognition.

It goes without saying, A.F. Dobrynin said, that we have not forgotten about the threat to peace from imperialist militarism and that we believe that there is no guarantee of the inevitability of positive processes in the international arena. Our actions in this area are aimed at relegating the "position of strength" policy to the archives. It must be replaced by civilized principles of international relations—dialogue, talks, and a search for mutually acceptable political solutions.

The problem of the correlation of universal human and proletarian-class interests in light of the new political thinking was also discussed. The speaker emphasized that active participation in the struggle for the solution of universal human problems, and primarily countering the nuclear threat, is in keeping with the fundamental social interests of the working people, above all the working class, as well as the interests of the liberation movement. It goes without saying that every party determines both the forms of its participation in the struggle for the solution of global problems and its specific tasks in respect to class problems and problems shared by all nations, as well as the means and methods to be used in tackling them in accordance with the specific conditions of the country and the special features of its international situation. In every instance the Soviet Union resolutely counters the policy of exporting counterrevolution with the concept of the people's freedom of choice in deciding their own path of development, a concept that occupies a key position in the new thinking.

The CPSU invariably expresses its solidarity with the struggle of the communist and workers parties and all social forces for peace and social progress, for freedom and democracy. During the period of restructuring of Soviet society we, in turn, highly value the solidarity of the fraternal parties.

The knowledge you have gained, A.F. Dobrynin said in conclusion, is an asset of the parties that sent you to study here and, consequently, the proper application of this knowledge is your lofty responsibility to the party.

A.F. Dobrynin congratulated the students on the completion of their studies and read the text of a greetings message addressed to them by the CPSU Central Committee.

Commentators Debate Restructuring Issues

PM1407152988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Discussion between IZVESTIYA political observers Aleksandr Bovin, Vitaliy Kobysh, and Stanislav Kondrashov: "The Priorities of the New Thinking"; date and place not given—first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Ahead lie both practical and philosophical in-depth assessments of the significance of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. The work of the conference and its results have become the "number one" topic in foreign newspaper, radio, and television reports and commentaries and are being mentioned in statements by statesmen, politicians, and public figures from the most varied countries of the world.

What has caused this, what is behind it?—IZVESTIYA political observers Aleksandr Bovin, Vitaliy Kobysh, and Stanislav Kondrashov ponder this.

Bovin: In my opinion, the main thing is that people's imagination has been captured by the transformations that are taking place in our country, by their scope and their radicalism. This is possibly the greatest change in the life of the USSR since October 1917. Our friends, our enemies, and all our partners realize that not only the fate of our country but also the course of events throughout the world depends on what we are doing now....

Kobysh: The rapid path toward mutual understanding and pooling efforts is the only one for mankind if it wants to find salvation. While abiding by our ideological positions, we must be more tolerant and try to have a better understanding of one another. Otherwise the missiles themselves will begin firing.

As a matter of fact, a most serious threat has loomed over human civilization anyway: There is a lack of oxygen, ozone, drinking water, and food. What's the point of wars, including "cold" wars when everything will come to its logical conclusion quite soon without them if urgent resolute steps (by common efforts, of course) are not taken?

Kondrashov: I'll take up the word "oxygen." Current events in our country are supplying political oxygen—not only for us either. The interest in the party conference is concrete proof of the interconnectedness of the modern world. This must be the case in the nuclear electronic age, especially in relations between the two great nuclear powers. One power, the Soviet Union, is engrossed in tasks of deepening restructuring and is up to its eyes in internal affairs. But internal affairs imperiously demand an appropriate foreign policy—a more constructive, flexible, and enterprising policy. At the same time our involvement in restructuring most convincingly illustrates our peaceful aspirations and that is why—interconnectedness once again—we are being gazed at from all sides: People want to know what the fate of restructuring will be, how it is developing, and its successes and failures. Still there are more people of good will than people of ill will. They see in restructuring the Soviet Union's readiness to make an ever increasing contribution to the cause of building more normal and more humane international relations. A Western journalist said: "We are not players in this great drama, but spectators." But, let me add, interested spectators.

Kobysh: But some people are interested in ensuring that we fail in our plans and in our restructuring. However, their numbers are few. By and large people abroad regard everything that is going on in our country sympathetically and expectantly.

Bovin: It seems to me that the key idea in the Central Committee report is the implementation of the new political thinking as the methodological and philosophical base for updating foreign policy.

Self-criticism is one of the most constructive elements in the new political thinking. For it is impossible to advance without having understood what you are leaving behind. The narrow circle of people involved in the adoption of foreign policy decisions can by no means always ensure the optimality and correctness of such decisions. I hope that an effective mechanism will now be set up within the reform of the political system to discuss foreign policy questions. Consideration of public opinion is an important reserve for updating foreign policy.

Kobysh: At any rate we are all coming back to the same problem of glasnost, both in international relations and also in our internal life. The 19th party conference confirmed that glasnost will manifest itself in our country in the most diverse forms—ranging from discussion of foreign policy problems in the course of the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet, notably through deputies' inquiries, to information that will be made public irrespective of how—well or badly—things are going in our country in a particular sphere.

Kondrashov: Ye.I. Chazov, USSR minister of health, said that we are somewhere between 60th and 70th out of 126 countries in terms of the proportion of the GNP spent on public health. But how do we rate for military expenditure? Don't get me wrong. Defense capability is a sacred matter, especially for a people with our historic memories. But it is not sacred in the sense of religious devotion, a fetish, or blind faith. Thought must go into this. The people must be aware of this thought. I realize that our leadership is beginning to think most strictly. For when we talk about the task of ensuring security by political rather than by military means, we mean reinforcing and reducing the cost of security. Political and diplomatic means are cheaper than military means. The democratic method of adopting foreign policy and military-political decisions is more reasonable—and cheaper once again—than the authoritarian method. Take Afghanistan, the case of the medium-range missiles, and, in the more distant past, the Caribbean missile crisis. This is how I understand the approach to questions of military building depicted in M.S. Gorbachev's report: Less is better, definitely better. The idea of the new role of public opinion in shaping internal and foreign policy and, of course, of increasing the role of the Supreme Soviet is very important.

Bovin: What has been said conveyed yet another most important element in the new political thinking—realism.

That is the foundation. We are learning not to exceed our real capabilities. We are learning to see unpleasant facts. We are learning to correlate our wishes, programs, and actions with the real state of affairs.

The new political thinking demanded that we move from discussions on disarmament and from propaganda to action. It is no coincidence that M.S. Gorbachev described disarmament as the main area of world politics. That is realism. For the global problems surrounding mankind cannot be resolved without disarmament.

Kondrashov: The fate of restructuring depends on the successes of our foreign policy and on how the world reacts to it just as it depends on our domestic successes. If we do not secure a stable reduction in the level of military confrontation and if it begins to rise once again along with military expenditure, the potential of restructuring will hardly be fully revealed. Guns or butter—in this interconnected world the quality of our daily life is also determined by the international backdrop.

Now back to the question of the new thinking. The following definition, inter alia, can also be put forward: It is scientifically perceived common sense, it is, if you will, the newly-awakened human instinct for self-preservation, which is prompting various states to embark on dialogue and cooperation with different systems in the same nuclear age on the same planet earth. Faced with the threat of universal destruction, people are learning to perceive themselves above all as people, particles of humanity. They are learning to perceive others above all as people. Notwithstanding all the contradictions in development, common sense can be found increasingly clearly in our relations with other countries, not least in Soviet-U.S. relations.

Bovin: It is common sense that is forcing general human interests and the interdependence and collaboration of all states into the foreground. Unfortunately, fashion also infiltrates science. Sometimes the stress and emphasis on general human interests began to counter the class approach and cancel out the latter. There is no abstract man, no state in general. There are classes, social groups, and social strata. There's no getting away from it. Common human interest is not supraclass but interclass. It means that there are "points" where the interests of various groups and antagonistic classes come together. Hence—the possibility of cooperation, collaboration, and compromises.

Kobysh: We must not forget that our problems are at times different from those tormenting the "Third World." One-third of the people in the world are in fact dying of starvation and, naturally, these people have their own priorities. I have had occasion to hear the following kind of statements: You Soviets reach agreement with the Americans on the elimination of nuclear weapons but we are worried about other things: We have nothing to eat. We must regard this as a problem of paramount importance, it's dynamite.

Bovin: Let's go back to the mainstream of our conversation. We are proposing the restructuring of the whole system of international relations. We are not only proposing but are also clearly showing the avenues for such restructuring. Demilitarization. Democratization. It is a question of reducing as far as possible the role of the strong-arm factor in world politics. And "in return" boosting the role of public opinion and the role of moral criteria and moral assessments of policy, that is humanizing international relations.

If we want people to understand and heed us, we must understand and heed others.

One other thing. We do not have a monopoly on truth. The new political thinking is an open system. We are prepared to listen to the voice of reason wherever it may come from.

Kondrashov: Startling things have occurred most recently, virtually within the last year. Polls in West European countries show that the public there believe more in the sincerity of the Soviet Union and the Soviet leadership on questions of disarmament than in the United States and the White House. Although a majority also—there must be no mistakes here—consider America the senior partner and are loyal to NATO. The same changes are also taking place among Americans. I will say the following: This illustrates that our foreign policy is paying dividends, yielding profits, and producing benefits, and, moreover, if things continue to go this way we will perceive these profits in our life, in our stores, and on our tables—the profits acquired from a calmer international situation.

Bovin: There must be an "end product."

Kondrashov: Isn't the Washington treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles the end product? Our inspectors have already flown out to San Francisco and theirs have come to our country to observe the destruction of missiles. Inspectors are cheaper than missiles. The Washington treaty is an example of innovation and boldness. We could do with a little bit more of them.

Kobysh: People in all socialist countries very attentively observed the course of the 19th party conference and are now throughly studying its documents. This is not abstract but strictly practical interest. Each socialist country has its own problems, its own history, its own experience, but all the same our experience is of interest and importance to them. I also hope that the conference will set a trend for greater coordination in the foreign policy of the socialist community states.

Voter Terms Election 'Mockery of Democracy'

PM1307090988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
7 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Vladimir Kuzemko, 31-year-old nonparty member and worker at the "Dneproplastmass" Production Association, under the rubric "From the Editors' Mail": "Why I Voted Against. Confession of an Ordinary Voter"]

[Text] The 19th all-union party conference discussed the reform of the electoral system. Its purpose is to ensure the free nomination of candidate deputies and the broad, all-around discussion of them so that elections may be the natural result of the expression of the voters' will. Yes, such a reform is needed! This is why I am sending the newspaper my confession.

On 28 February this year an election to the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities was held in the No. 39 Dnepropetrovskiy Electoral Okrug to replace a departed deputy. I was one of the 99.96 percent who participated and one of the 0.2 percent of the voters who voted against the candidacy of V.I. Shimko, USSR minister of the radio industry. I will stipulate at once that I have had and now have no specific complaints against him personally, particularly as any other person could have found himself in V.I. Shimko's place. Today

I would like to explain the reasons for that decision and give an account to the people, to the leading bodies, and to what is, for me, the most important directive organ—my conscience.

There is a prologue to this story.

Regular elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet were held in 1984. V.G. Boyko, who shortly before had become first secretary of Dnepropetrovsk party obkom, was elected a deputy. I voted for him. Why? I could see that the oblast's standing was good, and that inspired trust in the person of Boyko, who had worked here for more than a decade and had developed into first secretary before our eyes. I had read his speeches and articles in the local press and heard the accounts of those who had on various occasions had contact with him, and I was impressed by his vigor, purposefulness, persistence, and competence. Of course, I also saw a lot that was negative around me, but I considered them individual shortcomings that were being eradicated and that would soon be totally eliminated. In short, I voted for V.G. Boyko wholeheartedly, believing in him both as a man and as a leader. And his subsequent election as a member of the CPSU Central Committee at the 27th party congress only strengthened my trust.

I do not know about my fellow residents in the oblast, but for me personally the decisions of the party obkom plenum held at the beginning of 1987 came like a bolt from the blue. It turned out that commissions of the CPSU Central Committee and the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee had discovered in the oblast not just some individual shortcomings and defects but very serious mistakes and abuses. It also turned out that V.G. Boyko was the chief and almost the only guilty person. Party, soviet, and economic workers described in the oblast newspapers how well they had understood in the past the erroneousness of his line and how he had not accepted their criticisms and had done only what he considered necessary.

I read, and I thought: Why had they not sounded the alarm earlier? Why had they not asked the CPSU Central Committee to put V.G. Boyko right? Why had they not submitted their disagreements to be judged by the oblast party organization? The passivity and unscrupulousness of his colleagues meant that the party obkom first secretary was not stopped in time and went too far in his mistakes. And all this at the very height of restructuring, during precisely those months and weeks when he and his future opponents were urging others from high rostrums to be honest and principled and to strictly observe Leninist norms of life...

After that I made the decision never to vote blindly but to support with my vote only someone in whom I personally have absolute confidence.

It was in this frame of mind that I read the report in the Dnepropetrovsk press early in 1988 that V.G. Boyko had asked to be released from his duties as USSR Supreme Soviet deputy and that USSR Radio Industry Minister V.I. Shimko was being nominated as a candidate deputy in his place. I at once asked myself: What was it that occasioned the need to replace Deputy V.G. Boyko with another deputy? Was it the fact that Boyko had compromised himself by mistakes? But if the former obkom first secretary had not been removed from the Central Committee at a single one of the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, consequently his mistakes had not been great enough to draw such a conclusion. If, despite everything, he was still worthy of the rank of CPSU Central Committee member, why was he not worthy to be a Supreme Soviet deputy? Was it the fact that V.G. Boyko no longer worked in our oblast? But the new deputy does not work in Dnepropetrovsk either....

In addition, I doubt whether a USSR Supreme Soviet deputy has the right to resign voluntarily. We have entrusted to him the duties of the people's elected representative, and we alone have the right to release him from them. And I believe that in such cases elections must be held in two stages. At the first stage the voters decide whether to meet the deputy's wish to renounce his duties (for we can refuse). And only then—at the second stage—we decide whom to elect as deputy in his place. So I, the voter, was not informed of the reasons for V.G. Boyko's resignation as a deputy nor asked for my consent to that.

Further. Why did a Moscow minister prove most worthy to represent my interests and those of other Dnepropetrovsk residents at the USSR Supreme Soviet? Why was he the only candidate? The oblast is faced with many very complex problems today, there are different views on how to resolve them, including by using the platform of the supreme organ of Soviet power, and there are also, undoubtedly, most authoritative representatives of these different views. So why the striking unanimity with which the "Dnepropetrovskiy Mashinostroitelnyy Zavod" Production Association, the university, and the "Samarskaya" Mine nominated the candidacy of a minister from Moscow, while thousands of other labor collectives, so it turns out, could find no other worthy candidacies? What kind of elections are they if there is no choice itself?

I believed that in the age of restructuring, glasnost, and democratization—particularly after the most annoying and most shameful misfire with the previous deputy—I, an ordinary voter, would be offered a choice of several candidates and that each of them would set forth his action program as a deputy in the pages of Dnepropetrovsk newspapers. And I, the voter, would thoughtfully study all these programs, take a close look at the personalities of the candidates themselves, carefully weigh all the "pros" and "cons," and only then decide whom to vote for. None of this happened: neither different candidates nor programs.

And I thought: Perhaps I had simply missed the moment when the minister of the radio industry became the favorite of the people of Dnepropetrovsk, when he became so authoritative among us that he eclipsed absolutely all others? I started to wait for the minister to come to Dnepropetrovsk and persuade me, the voter, that I should vote for him.

And then 3 days before the election the city newspaper DNEPR VECHERNIY carried a report on his meeting with voters. I read that report attentively, for it was the only one at my disposal in order to make a decision. Representatives of the collectives that had nominated V.I. Shimko's candidacy spoke. It turns out that they have known him a long time, from his work on the CPSU Central Committee apparatus. It turns out that he has sometimes come to Dnepropetrovsk on business, and during these brief visits the people of Dnepropetrovsk managed to discern in him "modesty, accessibility, benevolence, attention toward people, and high erudition." How many pounds of salt do you have to eat together in order to get know a person so well?—I thought on reading this part of the report. But let us take it as firmly established that the candidate deputy is precisely as he is depicted—are modesty, accessibility, benevolence, and erudition really quite sufficient to become a USSR Supreme Soviet deputy?

I read on: "...The speakers cordially thanked the candidate deputy for agreeing to run for election." And again I could not understand: Just what had the minister managed to do for me by agreeing to run, that I, the voter, should also thank him? Or does Dnepropetrovsk Oblast already have such a bad reputation in the country that only the most desperate people agree to be elected by us to the USSR Supreme Soviet?

I reached that part of the report where the voters start giving mandates to their future deputy. One complained that Denpropetrovsk's telephone network is being developed only slowly because insufficient equipment is being allocated to telephone exchanges. I guessed that the minister was being asked to exercise his considerable power to ensure that we are sent more of this equipment at the expense of those cities that do not have an influential Moscow comrade among their deputies. Another speaker complained that Dnepropetrovsk is provided with only 80 percent of its requirement for vegetable storage facilities. I thought: Before constructing new storage facilities, for which my fellow countrymen were reckoning on extracting funds with the minister's help, would it not be better first to instill order in those that have already been constructed?

V.I. Shimko was the last to speak. He thanked the voters "for the high trust shown in him," said how the working people of Dnepropetrovsk should work in the age of restructuring, and promised that he "will apply all his strength, energy, and knowledge to worthily representing his voters' interests in the supreme organ of state power."

Not a word about what kind of positive action program he has as a USSR Supreme Soviet deputy or why I, the voter, should vote for precisely him. The minister was confident that I would not be making myself scarce and would vote for him all the same.

He was confident because, unlike me, he probably does not suffer from naivety and has thorough knowledge of all the features of the functioning of our electoral system. After all, in elections, particularly when the one being elected holds high office, we are always "in favor." "In favor" of Brezhnev. "In favor" of Chernenko. "In favor" of Boyko. "In favor" of Shimko—as long as he occupies a ministerial chair. We are accustomed to this. This is our tradition.

When and under what circumstances did it come into being?

It seems to me that a statement recently cited in the central press will be the best answer to this question.

Addressing the 18th party congress, I.V. Stalin said: "Certain Western press figures allege that the purging of spies, assassins, and pests such as Trotskiy, Zinovyev, Kamenev, Yakir, Tukhachevskiy, Rozengolts, Bukharin, and other monsters from Soviet organizations 'shook' the Soviet system and introduced 'demoralization.' This vulgar gossip is to be scoffed at. ...In 1937 Tukhachevskiy, Yakir, Uborevich, and other monsters were sentenced to be shot. After that, elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet were held. The elections gave to Soviet power 98.6 percent of all the votes cast. At the beginning of 1938 Rozengolts, Rykov, Bukharin, and other monsters were sentenced to be shot. After that elections were held to the union republic supreme soviets. The elections gave to Soviet power 99.4 percent of all the votes cast. I wonder where the signs of 'demoralization' are here and why this 'demoralization' did not affect the election results?"

Indeed, why? People were being arrested, and tens of thousands of totally innocent people devoted to their people and to socialism were being shot, but at the same time the people voted practically unanimously for Yezhov, for Beriya, for Stalin—and it turned out that they were voting for repression, for the personality cult, for future stagnation in the country's development... What was this? Fear? Self-deception? Indifference?...

No, we have no need of such traditions! A parody of elections, a mockery of democracy, an insult against Leninism, manipulation of the people's will on the part of a bureaucratic apparatus highly adept at this—this is what it was....

Was—or is it still? It seems to me that the 28 February election in Dnepropetrovsk showed that democratization itself stands behind words about democratization in far from all of our country's "cities and villages," that stubborn and fierce resistance to real restructuring processes sometimes lies behind calls for restructuring, and that the bureaucracy continues to champion its own positions, placing itself above the people and disregarding the people's will, thoughts, and conscience.

I am an ordinary, totally unremarkable Soviet person, and I have done nothing heroic in my life. But I am a son of my fatherland, I believe in restructuring, I do not want stagnation, and I do not want "leaders" who hide behind my credulity and my indifference ever in the future to trample on honor, truth, conscience, and justice and to have an opportunity to retard the onward movement of the mighty power in which I live.

Will the USSR minister of the radio industry be good or bad as the Supreme Soviet's deputy for Dnepropetrovsk Oblast. I do not know.... No one has convinced me of this. No one has even attempted seriously to convince me of this. And I will no longer vote blindly!

That is why I voted "against." Not "against" V.I. Shimko—"against" red tape. "Against" my own passivity and indifference. "Against" stagnation.

But "in favor" of restructuring!

IZVESTIYA's Laptev on Glasnost, Privileges

LD1007194788 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1920 GMT 8 Jul 88

[From the "View" program, presented by (Vladislav Listov) and (Dmitriy Zakarov); interview with IZVESTIYA Chief Editor Ivan Dmitriyevich Laptev by (Zakarov); date and place not given—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [(Zakarov)] One of the most discussed topics at the party conference was glasnost. You talked about it among others. What in your view are the prospects for developing glasnost?

[Laptev] Of course, there was a good deal of criticism of the mass media at the party conference. Although, as you understand, the mass media only make up part of glasnost. I think that the idea of glasnost itself had a hard time as a whole. As Mikhail Sergeyevich put it very correctly, I think, glasnost was the heroine of the conference. I view the development of glasnost very optmistically, not only from the viewpoint of the work of the central newspapers. Today the people will not allow us to retreat from the positions that we have won. People will simply not understand if now or tommorrow they receive a paper that goes back to 3-4 years ago.

[(Zakarov)] A certain amount of confusion and it would seem, a drop in the pressure of glasnost, have affected the press after the party conference now. What do you think, why is this the case?

[Laptev] First of all, I don't agree with you.

[(Zakarov)] Not in all papers.

[Laptev] All right, that sounds better. You know, there has not been a drop in the pressure of glasnost in the press. We have discovered our lack of preparation for entering into work straight after the conference at the same level at which the conference was conducted. We proved to be—this has to be acknowledged quite definitely, and recently at our collegium this was even discussed—we proved to be unprepared for the fact that after the conference it would be impossible to work in the way that we worked before the conference.

[(Zakarov)] Some of the issues that were raised at the conference are not being covered in the press at the moment?

[Laptev] Soem are not being covered, and others are being covered. It will be a matter of just a few.

[(Zakarov)] Ivan Dmitriyevich, in many delegates' speeches issues were raised relating to social justice and all sorts of special privileges. What is your attitude toward this?

[Laptev] If we create some particular privileges, as we say now, this has to be done openly. We have to say this, because there is more talk here than action. The main thing for us as journalists is to learn to be clear what we are talking about. Very often when people talk about this—this was to be seen at the conference too—they talk about the unlawful actions that are committed or, to put it bluntly, are dealt in by certain comrades invested with power. If a person in a senior party post organizes a special hunting club, if he builds private residences for himself throughout the republic, keeps a huge staff there, and so forth, surely these are not privileges, it is lawlessness, and all this has definitely to be made public.

KOMMUNIST's O. Latsis on Rehabilitations

PM0107105288 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 28 Jun 88 p 15

[Interview with KOMMUNIST Deputy Editor Otto Latsis by Giulietto Chiesa; date and place not given]

[Excerpts] Moscow—[Passage omitted] [Chiesa] I would like to have a better understanding of the recent rehabilitations of Kamenev, Zinovyev, Pyatakov, and Radek. The West pays close attention to these aspects of your domestic debate. There is often some confusion, however. Indeed, "legal," rehabilitation is different from "party" rehabilitation, which is again different from "political" rehabilitation, that is, acknowledgment of the correctness or at least legitimacy of stances adopted by this or that party leader at particular moments in his life. From this viewpoint Bukharin's rehabilitation, which has already taken place legally, has not yet been followed by his official (albeit posthumous) return to the party's ranks. At the same time we have witnessed the "rehabilitation" of his political stances of the "right-wing deviation" period. However before the NEP Bukharin was one of the theorists of "war communism"....

[Latsis] I would define three distinct levels. The first is "civil" rehabilitation. The body which grants this is the Supreme Court. It is a process that is now coming to an end. The second is "party" rehabilitation, that is, posthumous readmission to the party. This process is by no means over, though in Bukharin's case it has actually now been resolved. In his case it has not yet been possible to trace the documents relating to his expulsion from the party. It is even possible that they do not exist and that he was not officially expelled. This issue also concerns Kamenev and Zinovyev, expelled at the 15th congress, together with other opponents—rightly so, in my opinion. However, they were readmitted to the party some years later—in 1932, I believe. Subsequently Stalin secured another expulsion, but on the basis of charges that have now been recognized as false. Thus party rehabilitation would now be entirely logical. Trotskiy's position is different, and I do not believe that his party rehabilitation would be right. This is my personal viewpoint. A third and different matter is "political rehabilitation." I do not believe there is any reason, for instance, for a political rehabilitation of Bukharin's stances of the "left-wing communism" period of 1918. On the other hand there are several reasons for now reappraising Bukharin's stances as a representative of so-called "right-wing deviation." In the 1928-29 controversy between Stalin and the majority of the Central Committee on the one hand and the Bukharin group on the other I believe that the latter was in the right, with regard to both the pace and the methods of industrialization and collectivization of the countryside. I therefore believe this forms the basis for complete political, not just party, rehabilitation.

[Chiesa] The word "rehabilitation" sounds very inadequate in this connection, however. It is more of a historical and political assessment or verdict.

[Latsis] It is indeed a very imprecise term. We should talk in terms of a reappraisal of particular political stances that were labeled counterrevolutionary at that time but that were not in fact so. Be that as it may, it must be reaffirmed quite clearly that it is by no means a crime to adopt erroneous political stances in a party debate. Having said that, however, an assessment of political stances cannot be evaded. The line that Kamenev and Zinovyev proposed to the 14th congress was the same subsequently taken up by Stalin and that we now criticize. Stalin rejected it at the time, only to adopt the slogans later, as he did repeatedly even with Bukharin's watchwords, when it suited him. In any case the stances adopted by Trotskiy, Kamenev, and Zinovyev during the period 1925-27 must be judged erroneous in the light of subsequent developments. Trotskiy was nevertheless a major party leader. His removal from the party's and country's history and the silence about the role he played in the revolution and civil war is entirely unacceptable. His words must now be published and made available to the public and scholars, albeit very belatedly. It is not obligatory to be in agreement. However, why should people not be able to read and discuss those stances? [passage omitted]

[Chiesa] The economist Selyunin recently published an essay that basically traces a line of continuity between Lenin and Stalin. Lenin supposedly already embodied at least some of the roots of Stalinism. Do you share this viewpoint? Unless I am mistaken, you believe that there was a sharp break, a kind of "revolution within a revolution." In his "Sons of Arbat" Anatoliy Rybakov describes an outright "Stalinist counterrevolution."

[Latsis] Let us proceed from the facts. The large majority of Central Committee members—the leadership body that emerged from the 12th congress—were killed before the 13th congress. This was an essential constituent element of a coup d'etat. The large majority of Leninist cadres in the party, state, and security forces were eliminated. The policy pursued by Stalin was more complex. In one way he did continue to build socialism, albeit in a distorted manner. He undoubtedly achieved an enormous feat. He undoubtedly led the country—unfortunately for the Soviet people. He undoubtedly led the country's defense against Nazism—again unfortunately for the Soviet people, who paid a disproportionately high price that could have been avoided. He continued the task, but very badly. He opted for "barracks communism" against the idea of scientific socialism. In this sense he disowned Lenin. The "swing" that he imposed was carried out in the name of socialism. Now we know that it was in a completely different direction. Of course Lenin's positions were different too in the various stages of his leadership of the revolutionary process. Many aspects of "war communism" were undoubtedly taken up by Stalin but the difference between the two situations was enormous. War communism in the midst of a civil war and amid still primitive conceptions of the revolutionary process was one thing. It was a very different matter to restore it in an even more drastic form after the NEP path had been taken. It was one thing to opt for that path when "we did not yet know" and quite another when "we did know." As far as the origins of Stalin's extremism are concerned, I believe they were as long way from Lenin. At least nobody has yet convincingly proved this association. I am unconvinced by the theories of those, including Selyunin, who regard the entire history of the communist idea as "marked" by a violent destiny. It leads to a paradoxical conclusion, namely, that Stalin's most resolute critics ultimately justify what he did, considering it inevitable and historically necessary. I believe, however, that Stalin was neither inevitable nor necessary.

Weekly Reviews Anthology on Restructuring

PM1107140288 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 27, 3 Jul 88 p 15

[Vitaliy Korotich article: "Learning To Call a Spade a Spade"]

[Text] Aleksandr Bovin: There is one clear criterion which will determine our success: the number of people striving to go "there" should become substantially less than the number of people striving to come here "from there".

Tatyana Zaslavskaya: One of the tasks is to renew the composition of the country's political leaders so that they are younger and have more radical political and economic views as well as higher professional qualifications and socio-personal qualities.

Andrey Sakharov: The KGB played a complicated role in the 70s and 80s. On the one hand—merciless repressions against dissidents. On the other—the KGB was nearly the only force left untouched by corruption—thanks to its eliteness—and so it could confront a mafia.

Vasiliy Selyunin: Structural perestroyka, which has become a pressing problem, is incompatible with inflated quotas. We must treat the possible unfulfilment of plans for the current five-year plan calmly.

The above opinions from the collection "Nothing Else Is Available" (edited by Yuriy Afanasyev, D.SC. (History)) show that Progress Publishers is recommending its work to readers as Soviet political literature of a new type. The collection contains articles by a number of "MN" contributors: Aleks Adamovich, Yevgeniy Ambartsumov, Fedor Burlatskiy, Anatoliy Butenko, Daniil Granin, Len Karpinskiy, Yuriy Karyakin, Andrey Nuyhin and Gavriil Popov among others. The book was published from the 19th Party Conference.

I liked the book for its insistence on the truth, its belief in the people and their vitality, its joyful fearlessness and indifference to the warnings about misunderstandings. In the past we were always afraid: "What if what we are saying is understood differently?" Today, many of the masters of "understanding differently" are still in their posts. Only now they are vigorously fighting what they so passionately defended just a few years ago. Still, these masters haven't lost their old knack. So to publish this collection, the authors and editors had to have not only talent, but also firmness. It is good that they had plenty of both.

We're learning to see the whole.

We're fearing less and less, though they don't let us forget about our fear. Thus it is not surprising that nothing Else Is Available is so full of self-congratulation, even raptures over the authors' own bravery. We are gradually learning democratic norms, we are learning to argue and call a spade a spade. And we must call them—we must make politically unequivocal evaluations. The book doesn't avoid them. L. Batkin, for instance, rightly noted that without millions joining the political struggle, we won't achieve economic results. Life is in the whole picture. We analyze all of it and the sparks that fly when perestroyka clashes with everyday life are very bright in the collection's best works. You must try to get this book and read it. I can't understand why such an important collection deserved a paltry 50,000 copies. And the book won't go on sale until after the Party Conference.

It is a very strong book. Some articles are familiar: they have been previously published in periodicals. One remembers them. Essentially, the book is the first anthology of its kind—of articles on the democratic process and on the new life—and an excellent one, an outstanding event in our social life.

I'm sure of my assessment. We've long since unlearned how to rejoice over outstanding works and how to get angry over mediocre things. The criteria changed. We, laughing silently, exulted at Brezhnev's literary pseudo-genius, losing respect for ourselves and hammering deep into our subconsciousness the thought that it was best to be an indifferent mediocrity. Alas, the belief lives long—in his foreword, Yu. Afanasyev notes mournfully that "the book doesn't reflect the opinions of many in the intelligentsia who regard perestroyka as a joyful but inevitably short thaw. After which the cold will come again". They're not singing with us but so far they're not singing against us.

A few days ago I had a disagreement with the deputy editor-in-chief of a big Moscow paper. "I don't want to die with these people or the other people," he said angrily. "I just want to do my job and the rest doesn't matter. Why can't you see that we were and we are a service industry?"

We quarreled not because I couldn't agree with the editor but because the editor fatalistically believes the old Stalin way will return and that there is no other way to manage our society—only suppression and pure administratorship. What can I say—there are those who stubbornly refuse to analyze Stalinism; others are used to living under totalitarianism; still others would like to restore it. And if in the political hysterics of a well-known writer with his call for a "literary Stalingrad" we could detect the idiosyncrasies of talent, then in the letter to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA from N. Andreyeva, the idea of restoring Stalinism is said directly and in all seriousness.

I once talked to a surveyor Party leader in Kolyma. He complained that it was very hard to look for minerals. "A bulldozer driver removes the top layer of earth and comes across a burial ground—not even a burial ground but a layer of dead bodies. It is hard to crack the earth in permafrost, and bodies do not lie deep. The permafrost preserved them intact, like mammoths who lie in the earth for thousands of years." He added pensively: "Only frost on their beards. Otherwise they are just like living people. How am I supposed to go through them?"

The overcoming of Stalin's terrible legacy—"going through him"—is connected with learning the lessons of the past and with the desire of the entire people not to let the criminal order be restored. Not to let fair opinions be ignored or the truth be covered over.

So often we have replaced the truth with all sorts of considerations; it's high time we understood how much we need the truth to save ourselves today.

Nothing Else Is Available is by optimists. By people who don't underestimate the difficulties, but who aren't looking for foreign and internal enemies to justify our own failures.

It is a book about exactness, about how far we've already progressed in transforming our lfie and how much further there is to go. The ideas are different, even when the topic is not, i.e., problems of our administration and talk about free, more democratic elections. It also includes Sakharov's proposal on reducing the time one must serve in the army and his opinion that the anti-perestroyka mafia is involved in events in Sumgait. Granin demands that the hangmen of "Stalin's time" be called to account. Many articles discuss the braking mechanism, and how to overcome it. None of the articles can be reduced to one or two ideas—and there is no need to do that. As Yu. Afanasyev writes, "the abundance of opinions in the collection is huge". Some opinions clash with others. There are attempts, made right under our eyes, to speak to the problem seriously and to offer ways of dealing with it.

Not everybody likes the sincerity and the thirst for the truth with which this book brims. More than that, I'm afraid that the unrestraint of this or that formula could be used by those who like to meddle. Let's confront the violators together—those who panic when they see "left liberals", whom the odious N. Andreyeva dislikes and regards as the root of all non-patriotism and evils. The book is very optimistic and proves the colossal vitality of our society and our Party's ideas, which are embodied in perestroyka as the only road to a worthy life. So let's win. Nothing else is available.

Weekly Ponders Soviet History 1917-1927

PM0807090088 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 Jul 88 p 13

[Viktor Listov article under new rubric "Chronicle of the Decades": "The Young Revolution: 1917-1929"—first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] [illegible] year the history examinations were canceled in the 10 [illegible] of school. What could a school graduate say about [illegible] events of the post-October period, where could he obtain objective information, if the old textbooks gave inaccurate, distorted facts, and even lies?

Yes, today we have to build anew not only our present and future. History is being rewritten too.

The rubric "Chronicle of the Decades," which this item opens, will not, of course, be a substitute for a textbook. But its materials will, we hope, bring us closer to historical truth, to the real events of the era of October.

The first decade after October was a legendary time. Do you remember? "We are the Red cavalry, and the tellers of tales tell our story." The epics, the heroic tradition, have always rang out and will always ring out in the people's memory of the revolution and the civil war. Alongside the names of Ilya Muromets and Dobrynya, Razin and Pugachev [legendary or semihistorical Russian heroes], future generations will name Chapayev and Shchors, Budenyy and Kotovskiy....

But the legendary—however much delight we may take in its beauty—is no substitute for the facts. And facts and more facts are what our skeptically minded contemporary, who is tired of legends (not always, let us observe, originating among the people), demands. And he is right, this contemporary of ours. Only recently I was at a lecture about the First Cavalry, the heroic captains of the civil war. The lecturer described the exploits well and enthusiastically until he was thrown by a question from the floor: Is it true that at the eighth party congress Klim Voroshilov took part in the opposition and came out against Lenin?

The time has come to test the harmony of myth against the algebra of historical research, or even the simple arithmetic of comparison with documentary evidence. I will take the liberty of not answering the question about Voroshilov here—there is not enough space; if he likes the reader can find out the answer for himself. I will talk about something else. What the first decade of the revolution meant for our history.

A newspaper page is too small to recount in detail the course of events from the storming of the Winter Palace to the celebrations of the 10th anniversary of October. Especially since the main points in this progress are well known to everyone. It would be awkward here to set forth in chronological order how the country progressed from the Brest peace to "war communism," and then to the NEP [New Economic Policy] and beyond —to the start of the socialist reconstruction of the economy. We have well and truly chewed the stale cud of the textbook, from which all the colors of those times have been expunged. This version is even cast in bronze. On Vosstaniye [Uprising] Square in Moscow, a memorial plaque hangs to this day: "Here the battles of... the workers' militia were held." One wants to amend it: It was your tedious measures that "were held." Battles, on the contrary, raged, blazed, or at the very least took place. And blood was shed. But here, they say that battles, like meetings, "were held."

No, not for nothing do many of us want to forget everything we learned about what "was held" in early Soviet history, and begin all over again.

Only we must not take the easy path—the path of endlessly reproaching the historians. They failed to discover this, failed to teach that. Of course, science, hobbled by myths, is not beyond reproach. Nonetheless the years 1917-1927 were studied far better than the subsequent periods. The reasons lie in the very nature of the era. What a historian concerned with the thirties and forties pieces together, bit by bit, in archives that are hard to gain access to, his colleague concerned with the twenties simply finds in the newspapers. From October, for instance, secret diplomacy is abolished—international politics are pursued before all the people's eyes. The reports of Soviet institutions are printed—including the Cheka [All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counterrevolution and Sabotage]. Critical arrows are regularly fired from the bottom to the top, hitting party and Soviet leaders at every level, not omitting even Lenin. In a word, the glasnost we are now only fighting for was achieved then.

The era apparently concealed nothing, and it is no accident that its poet [Mayakovskiy], as if to push future researchers aside, insisted: "I will tell of my times and of myself."

But it is here that we find the main fault in our historical vision—the fault of gullibility. Just as a man cannot be judged by what he thinks about himself, so an era cannot be evaluated solely by its ideological manifestations.

In no other historical period have the sign, the symbol, the slogan been as influential and powerful as in the first post-October years. World justice and universal happiness seemed tantalizingly close—all you had to do was stretch out your hands, armed with the hammer and sickle. "We will drive mankind to happiness with an iron hand"—that was inscribed on a Moscow building in 1919. "Long live the golden age!"—that poster was carried by demonstrators in Petrograd on 7 November 1918. "Here all are equal, as they are in the bathhouse"—that adorned the window of the railroad ticket office in the "Metropol," where there was a real waiting line and no special mandates operated.

The illusion of the proximity of the "golden age" also lived on in the mind of the poet, who, in telling of the times and of himself, was not usually naive. But everyone remembers his lines about the first moments of the revolution: "The October winds blew, as always. Winding their way along the rails across the bridge, the streetcars continued their course—under socialism now." Of course, scientific accuracy cannot be expected in a poetic figure of speech. All the same, the image of the streetcar passenger who crosses from capitalism into socialism on Troitskiy Bridge is highly indicative.

The separation of words and concepts from the scientific content expressed by these words and concepts had begun—and, as we have seen, had begun fairly early. Columns of demonstrators marched over that same Troitskiy Bridge carrying the placard "Long live socialism!", and nobody stopped to wonder how you could call for the long life of something that was not yet born, not yet built. For the mass consciousness, being far removed from analytical potential, the very name "socialist republic" was identified with socialism. The same, only in reverse, could be heard in the White Guard camp: "Look, gentlemen, they have communism, but they have nothing to eat...."

Our disputes today on the nature of the society we live in and on its prospects have their roots in the "morning of the soviets" with its sloganizing directness and its ascetic simplicity of judgments. The danger of substituting slogans for the real thing was perceived by Lenin, who warned against it: "...If the name 'Communist Party' is interpreted as if the communist system were being implemented now, the result will be a very great distortion and practical harm amounting to empty bragging." And he went on: "How to put into practice the transition...to socialism, which is new, not yet born, and has no stable base—that is the most difficult task. This transition will take many years at best."

These sober warnings coexist, live in the same time and space as euphoria and empty bragging. Late 1919 and early 1920 bring victories in the civil war, and it seems to many "fiery orators" that hunger, ruin, and social injustice will disappear from our land together with the last soldier of the entente. The apparition of instantaneous socialism appears now on Troitskiy Bridge, now elsewhere, and not only to poets.

In 3 years of war, many people became accustomed to "war" concepts of socialism and communism. Communism is when people in leather jackets demand unquestioning discipline and obedience; when the brain is at the center, and on the periphery there are only blind instruments, only executors eternally goading you on ("to the highest degree"). For instance, Trotskiy saw no way ahead "without the establishment of a regime under which every worker feels himself to be a soldier of labor who cannot freely dispose of himself or throw over a duty he has been given, but must fulfill it; if he does not fulfill it, he will be a deserter, who is punished."

It is hard to imagine more open despotism under the Red flag. But in the war years many people formed a preconception based on their own bitter experience: Either militarize our plant, sovkhoz, or institution, and give us Red Army rations, or else things will not work. Among the questions examined by the government not long before the transition to the NEP there was even a plan for the militarization of the Moscow movie school (the future All-Union State Institute of Cinematography). The plan was rejected, but its very submission is symptomatic. The then leaders of art discussed seriously, as you can see, military methods of education in an artistic VUZ.

I have too much respect for the reader to start explaining the reasons why Lenin and his supporters came out in favor of the transition from "war communism" to an economic policy based on economic, market methods of economic management. Many thousands of pages have been written about this. They are not all equally valuable, but in the end they are right—orders had to give way to sober calculations, the class distribution of products to trade, and the commissar's famous Mauser to the economic manager's briefcase packed full of summaries of tariffs and estimates and surveys of the trade situation.

It is also necessary to guard against the frivolous and hasty parallels that are often drawn between the transition to the NEP and our current problems. Yes, in the documents and newspapers of 1921-1922 you can often come across such terms as "restructuring," "glasnost," and even "acceleration." The vocabulary is similar, but nonetheless the substance of the matter is not quite the same.

The country that went over to the NEP was utterly ruined and starving and had lost at least 8 million people at the front and in the rear. Metal production fell almost to the 18th century level. The restructuring of that time was based on replacing food requisitioning with a tax in kind on peasants; city dwellers acquired the rest from the same peasant for money, on a free market. The initial task was formulated very modestly—to feed everyone and drive away the spectre of death by starvation. It was not at all a question of restructuring the cumbersome and ramified apparatus that controls the complex, multifaceted world of modern industry.

The NEP had its preparation not only in the objective course of events, but also in the consciousness and subjective habits of millions. The peasant had from time immemorial, as the saying goes, traded and taken to market any surplus of products from his farm. Therefore in the new conditions offered to him by the state, from the peasant's viewpoint things were far more what he was accustomed to than it might appear at first glance.

On the other hand, thousands of small businessmen still existed in the cities, ready to put their small capital into producing what the peasant needed. Immediately after the appropriate decrees, they started producing what was then in short supply. The city could supply the countryside with nails and calico, sugar and kerosene, soap and matches.

This did not fit in well with the dogmas of "war communism." It is curious to recall that even Lenin, the initiator of the new approach to economic management, avoided the word "trade" in the first weeks and months of the NEP. He preferred to speak of commodity exchange between the cities and the countryside, retaining a preference for the vocabulary of the preceding time. Later he put forward the famous slogan "learn to trade!" and thereby brought words fully into line with deeds.

We have no power over the images of the past that have arisen in our consciousness. A cultivated person today, thinking about the early twenties, inevitably pictures Tatlin's tower [an experimental monumental tower designed for the 3d International], caricatures of pot-bellied NEP profiteers, and pointed Red Army helmets; and fragments of phrases ring in his ears about the victory of socialism over the louse or about Pushkin, who must without fail be thrown out of the steamship of the present day. All this makes its way from one book to the next, from one movie to the next. Yet the realities of the times sometimes had nothing in common with the little glimmers remaining on the surface of history.

Today it is far more important to remember the fundamental complexities and contradictions of the early twenties than the hackneyed outward signs. For instance, we rarely talk about what the acceleration of that time cost. It seems silly to ask: Was the electrification of Russia necessary? Of course it was necessary! But not many people could now name the sources that fed the fulfillment of the GOELRO [State Commission for the Electrification of Russia] plan. One of the main sources was the mass felling of the forests of northern Russia and their sale to the West for currency. There was simply no other way.

The famine in the Volga region, caused by the failure of the harvest and errors in economic policy, and the urgent needs of a regenerating country constantly demanded, even under the NEP, emergency measures that were still reminiscent of the recent wartime past. For instance, in the early twenties it was necessary to resort to mass confiscation of church valuables—to the indignant protests of thousands of believers, precious articles of church plate and the treasures of monastery sacristies went to pay for bread. Let me also remind you that many priests themselves approved of this state act and responded to it voluntarily.

At the beginning of the twenties two out of three inhabitants of European Russia and Western Siberia were illiterate. This constantly threatened to lead every initiative, without exception, into a blind alley and to wreck it. The main theme of the demands of the time was seized on with total accuracy by N.K. Krupskaya. "The masses," she wrote, "are tired of rallies, they go to rallies reluctantly now. The masses...want knowledge, they want to think everything out for themselves. The masses often lack purely formal knowledge and skills, such as the skill of reading and writing, which are needed to acquire knowledge, to consider independently what you are told, and to work with books." Hence the very broad network of educational establishments at the most diverse levels: schools, courses, literacy classes, and workers' faculties at VUZ's.

The Red Army becomes the main seat of the spread of literacy and knowledge. Millions of peasants passed through its ranks from 1918 and managed to acquire many cultural skills. By 1924 (compared with the civil war) the numerical strength of the Army had fallen to one-tenth of what it was: In the form of the demobilized Red Army men, the Russian countryside acquired its vanguard, the leaders of the struggle for a new life.

Among the almost forgotten signs of the times are such festivals of newly acquired abundance as the Nizhniy Novgorod fair in 1922 and the first agricultural exhibition in Moscow in 1923. The young director Dziga Vertov, shooting a documentary movie in the pavilions of this exhibition, tried to see its exhibits through the eyes of Yaroslavl peasant Vasiliy Filippovich Siryakov, who found much food for thought in inspecting the tools, experimental plots, and pedigree steers. Today we do not find this particularly striking. Many things were still lacking at the 1923 exhibition. But it also lacked something that, unfortunately, sprang up later—empty show. Everything that Siryakov saw was available and on sale, albeit not cheaply.

I think we should restore another facet of historical justice. Anyone could name without difficulty a dozen or so military leaders of the civil war. The captains of industry of the times of the first 5-year plans are also well known. But the leaders of the economic revival of the early twenties should not be forgotten either. The name Sergey Vasilyevich Malyshev (1877-1938) will not mean much to the modern reader. He was called the "red merchant." A storekeeper's son who went off to the revolution young, he had a subtle and accurate understanding of the mentality of the peasant, the merchant, and the craftsman. A faithful portrait of Malyshev, a calm, sensible man with a beard, is given in one of Babel's stories—the writer accompanied the "red merchant" on a trip along the Volga when Malyshev was successfully exchanging nails from the city for grain from the countryside. It was Malyshev who later chaired the fair committees in Irbit, Nizhniy Novgorod....

There are many instructive things in early Soviet history. For instance, the political system that grew up during the civil war and then operated almost until the end of the twenties. Its main characteristic was the one-party system.

If the space available on one page of a newspaper permitted it, it would be possible to trace how the tens and even hundreds of parties and political groups that sprang up between February and October 1917 broke up in the next 3-4 years and left the political stage. Of course, the more fiercely the civil war raged, the more views became polarized and the deeper the gulf between revolution and counterrevolution became. By 1918 the hypothetical Russian "parliament" could be assembled only on the map: the Bolsheviks in the Moscow-Petrograd center, the monarchists in the south, and the Social Revolutionary and Menshevik supporters of the Constituent Assembly in the Volga region.

But it is important not simply to compare the colors of party banners; it must also be remembered that conscious party-mindedness and adherence to a particular social doctrine was the privilege of very few. Lenin understood that very well at the time. Not for nothing did he say frankly that the party's proletarian nature is determined not by its membership, but by the very thin stratum of the "party guard." Thousands of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks had never read Marx, any more than thousands of anarchists carried the works of Proudhon and Kropotkin in their hands. The general thrust—"for or against revolution"—appeared at that time ot be more important than theoretical nuances. Therefore by the end of the Civil War the Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries (especially on the left), Bund supporters, and anarchists, who traditionally considered themselves revolutionaries, had not infrequently joined the victorious Bolshevik party.

Even in the White Guards' camp there were very interesting insights. For instance, in the early twenties the well known monarchist V. Shulgin surmised that in Russia, under the red banners, statehood and order, national greatness, and immutability of borders would triumph—that is, precisely the values for which he, Shulgin, had fought all his life. In any event, so it seemed to him.

Early Bolshevism incorporated not only all the forces of socialist transformation; it also spoke on behalf of the not yet completed democratic revolution. Ideological confrontations, opinions, and shades of opinion did not disappear. But they were manifested mainly within the Bolshevik party. Tolerating other political groups through inertia would have looked like a resurgence of civil war or deviation from the proletarian revolution.

The juxtaposition of opinions and sometimes a fierce struggle between groupings took place in the soviets, trade unions, cooperatives, and other public organizations, and in the press. This struggle was the basis, the motive force for the emergent political system. Of course, the builders of this political system, in the early days, lacked general cultural development and a profound democratic tradition. Therefore indications of instability and the approaching end of that historical phase can be detected fairly early.

In spring 1922 I.V. Stalin became general secretary of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee. The question why it was he who took that post needs special study. Formally, he belonged to the "party guard," but in terms of his character and the skills he had acquired in his activity, he was far removed not only from the party intelligentsia, but from the intelligentsia in general. Perhaps what brought him to the high party post was the distrust of the party's "grass roots" for the "top strata" that had formed, for people in pince-nez who "do not understand our worker-peasant interests." Perhaps the new generation of party members saw Stalin as a man who, crowding out the "old men," would help them to take a place on the leadership. On the other hand, General Secretary Stalin suited the intellectuals like Bukharin, when he helped them to hold onto their positions in the fierce intraparty struggle and when he spoke from notes not written by him. Stalin's callousness and cruelty and his fondness for repressions, known from the times of the civil war, did not worry anyone: At the time this was not seen as a failing.

The opinion is fairly widespread that spring 1922 was when Stalin came to power. Even Lenin's testament says that Stalin, having become general secretary, concentrated immense power in his hands. However, I think this well-known formula needs interpreting. It was not a question of "immense power" over the whole country. On becoming head of the party apparatus, the general secretary was still far from dictating his terms to the party, still less to the soviets, trade unions, cooperatives, and other mass organizations. To generalize, Stalin did not yet have power over a ramified and multifaceted political system. I will say more: The party tradition of those years by no means equated leaders with Central Committee secretaries. The posts of secretaries on the Central Committee were more organizational and technical than political. For instance, the Central Committee secretaries included Klavdiya Novgorodtseva, Yelena Stasova, Nikolay Krestinskiy, and V.M. Molotov, who was not well known then. And Lenin was never a Central Committee secretary.

The nationwide fame of such figures as Ya.M. Sverdlov, M.I. Kalinin, G.I. Petrovskiy, V.I. Lenin, and A.I. Rykov was based on the fact that they were at the head of the state and government, not at all on the fact that they held posts on the party apparatus.

This means that Stalin did not become omnipotent when he took the post of general secretary. It was later, with the passage of time, that he invested his post with that meaning. Historians argue about why the democratic system did not work, and these arguments are unlikely to disappear in the near future. Here it is important only to stress that the party apparatus by no means sought, in the early and mid-twenties, to appropriate the rights and duties of the soviets and other public institutions. The party's leading and guiding force was expressed more in moral authority than in decisions of an executive, administrative, or judicial nature.

Thus the celebrated GOELRO plan, which Lenin called the party's second program, was nonetheless adopted by the Eighth All-Russian Congress of **Soviets** [preceding word in boldface as published]. And the first 5-Year Plan, 9 years later, was finally approved by the supreme state organ—the Fifth Congress of Soviets of the USSR.

Soviet statehood took a major step forward in December 1922, when authorized representatives of the Soviet republics met for the First All-Union Congress of Soviets and unanimously adopted the Declaration and Treaty on the Formation of the USSR. The Union united four republics—the RSFSR, the Ukrainian SSR, the Belorussian SSR, and the Transcaucasian Federation.

The formation of the USSR was immediately conceived, from the very first days, as the first cell in a worldwide fraternity of peoples, the start of the rallying of working people of different nations. A characteristic feature of the times. A show was put on in the Bolshoy Theater for the delegates to the first congress—they gave excerpts from "Prince Igor," "Aida," "Carmen," and "The Snow Maiden." The decor was changed with the curtains open. And when, in a few minutes, the tavern from "Carmen" disappeared and the palaces of the Berendei appeared, the auditorium gave a mighty ovation to the stage workers. The delegates were thereby emphasizing that the workers are full participants in the theatrical presentation, while the working class is the basis of the universal international fraternity.

The need for unification of the republics was considered axiomatic and was dictated by the entire logic of economic activity and the development of national cultures. But here too there were decisions that tallied poorly with the circumstances of the transitional period. For instance, it was suggested that the written languages of all the peoples of the Union—first and foremost the Turkic-speaking peoples—should be switched to the Latin alphabet. The Slavonic languages would be no exception. We know that the real means of rapprochement among languages lay elsewhere. By the mid-twenties the new statehood had gained strength, although successes were not apparent in everything.

A brief notice in LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA reported in a calm, humdrum way that according to statistical data Leningrad had achieved the prewar level of nutrition. Only a few years earlier, in the years of the civil war, cities were emptying and becoming deserted. Moscow alone lost at least a million inhabitants. Now the development of the economy, science, technology, and culture led to the reverse process. Take almost any novel or sketch of the mid-twenties and you will be almost certain to find a description of the communal apartments, with people sleeping in the corridors on folding beds and trunks, and in the morning forming huge waiting lines at the faucets.

The growth of the cities, rapid and totally unregulated, lagged behind the real potential for providing everyone with a job, housing, a decent environment. The lines of the unemployed at the labor exchanges grew. In the newspapers of the time one often encounters reports like this: The Komsomol Central Committee calls on members of the Russian Komsomol not to seek places of residence in such-and-such cities (a list follows), because unemployment has worsened there.

But appeals did not help much. Migration was kept in check and regulated mainly by purely economic means; the enforced, administrative attachment of an individual to his place of residence was deemed to be one of the characteristics of the accursed exploitative past. The

"Short Soviet Encyclopedia" explained with revolutionary simplicity: "The passport system was a most important instrument of police influence.... Soviet law does not recognize the passport system." Therefore any document equally could serve as personal identification—a trade union card, pass, labor record, draft certificate, and so forth. Freedom of movement and freedom of residence were considered one of the great gains of the new system.

The mass consciousness became more down-to-earth and realistic than in the civil war years. Nonetheless the new situation generated new myths.

A drawing was published in the journal LAPOT. Two peasants are standing by a poster devoted to the union of the city and the countryside. On the poster a musical comedy peasant carrying a sheaf is theatrically shaking the hand of a worker carrying a hammer over his shoulder and a roll of calico under his arm. One peasant says to the other: "Look, Uncle Ivan, see what kind of union you can have. Look! And what did we get? They brought us two plows and some newspapers.... And that's all."

The urban folklore was equally colorful. One journal in the literary vanguard printed an article about the anecdotes that flooded Moscow. The author, with scientific pretensions, discovered the two main sources of the anecdotes. First, there is the vile milieu of NEP profiteers, dissatisfied with soviet power. And second there are the Communists themselves, often prominent party workers. In this case, the journal asserted, the anecdotes are a form of Bolshevik self-criticism. Many witty sayings were attributed at the time to the well-known Comintern figure Karl Radek. The NEP profiteers' anecdotes were not usually distinguished by any great subtlety. For instance: "Have you heard? Soviet power will fall in '27." "Why?" "Because under the CriminalCode, the supreme measure of punishment is 10 years."

But the NEP profiteers were not the only ones to be mistaken in their social predictions. As before, mental straightening out of the path to universal prosperity was not unusual. It occurred not only in journalism and folklore, but even, unfortunately, in state acts. Thus on 6 September 1926 the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the RSFSR Soviet of People's Commissars adopted a resolution on organizing forced labor outside custody. It explained that the proletarian state does not always put the criminal in prison or in a corrective camp. From now on, sentences were often served in a different way—at the place of work, or sometimes even at private enterprises.

At the same time real life did not always accord with the best intentions. The first large-scale camp operated from 1923, on the Solovetskiye Islands in the White Sea. In the mid-twenties it was inhabited, as a rule, by prisoners who were really guilty before the state—White Guards, participants in rebellions and uprisings, embezzlers, thieves, rogues, and other antisociam elements. But the regime set up on the Solovetskiye Islands was even then far removed from noble illusions. As often happens, the road to hell was paved with good intentions....

The first Soviet decade can be called a historical period only in relative terms, of course. It would be strange if a period lasted strictly 10 years, day for day. But all the same, by the end of that time features of the near future, the next historical phase, are already manifesting themselves. In order to understand which way the current of social development is flowing, it is necessary first of all to picture the situation in the countryside.

Running through many centuries of our country's history, we will hardly find a time to compare with the mid-twenties for the satiety and well-being of the Russian countryside. Associations for the joint cultivation of the land, artels, and agricultural communes were strictly voluntary associations, and therefore viable in the highest degree. One example is the Altay Commune where the father of the cosmonaut G.S. Titov worked in the twenties.

But all the same, the face of the countryside was determined not by collective forms of farming (by 1928 only 1.7 percent of peasant holdings had been socialized). The individual peasant holding was still decisively the country's main breadwinner. I will not bore the reader with statistical tables. I will confine myself to the pages of TORGOVO-PROMYSHLENNAYA GAZETA in early 1926. It published a poll carried out among the peasants of Tambov, Pskov, Omsk, and Samara Provinces and Uralsk Oblast. The questionnaires paint a complex, but on the whole very favorable picture. Harvests are good. The countryside now purchases not only essentials (the same old nails, textiles, kerosene), but also some of the luxuries of civilization—musical instruments, face powder, lipstick, and so forth.

However, serious contradictions are already clearly visible in peasant life. Here, in full, is a response to the questionnaire received from a peasant in Slavgorodskiy District, Omsk Province:

"Grain crop—average. But there is an adequate surplus of wheat. The potato crop is very good and we do not know what to do with the potatoes—we feed them to the livestock. We live well, but the trouble is, we do not know what to do with our money. We cannot spend it! We would like to buy livestock, build a new outhouse, sow more grain. We can't... Our young people are very mischievous and regard anyone who works successfully as a kulak. You set yourself up with three horses, and you are a 'kulak'! Sow 20 desyatinas [measure of land equivalent to 1.09 hectares] with grain—you're a kulak! Build a new hut—you're a kulak. So what can we do with our money? We are all afraid of being called kulaks. So we spend our money on nothing. And we buy vodka. Sometimes you would like to put some in the savings bank 'for a rainy day' and for various needs, but they ask you your name—well, that menas you're a kulak again: 'He has money in the bank'... So we steer clear of the savings bank and hide our bank notes in our socks. We are holding back grain. In June we will see what the harvest is like. Industrial goods exist, prices for them are high, but the grain will pay for it."

There are a great many shades of meaning in the response to the poll. The entire history of the end of the NEP could serve as a commentary on it. "We are holding back grain," the peasant says. The farmer is in no way to blame. It is an objective economic law that makes him delay in selling the grain. The less grain there is on the market, the more costly it is. That means it is advantageous to him to hold it back for a while. But it also means that the food shortage will gravely affect workers and all urban dwellers. The grain obtained through the tax-in-kind mechanism will not be enough for them.

Another aspect of the matter: By the logic of economic activity, the peasant seeks to earn as much as possible. But sometimes there is nowhere for him to put his money, and sometimes it is simply dangerous. The cautious Siberian peasant blames his fears on the mischievous young people, who will call him a kulak. In fact it is not the young people he is afraid of. The state anathema—"kulak"—will entail many troubles: increased taxation, and perhaps even confiscation of property under Article 107 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

Spending money "on nothing"—on vodka—is a mark of a patent lack of social well-being.

The confiscation of grain surpluses from the kulak (and, to be honest, not only from the kulak), which began in the second half of the twenties, was contrary to the Leninst principle—don't touch the peasants who pay the tax in kind. However, it is pointless to attribute this violation solely to malice on someone's part. There was an acute lack of industrial output on the market for developing the former, NEP economic system. The countryside now needed not only basic goods; it was on the brink of mass cultural consumption. But urban industry could not supply it. What next?

There were two alternatives. Either recognize the objective force of the laws of the market economy, and hence see the organic, natural improvement of urban and rural cooperation, enhanced labor productivity, the improvement of trade, the purely economic elimination of contradictions between the cities and the countryside. Or return to the harsh, noneconomic methods of the times of the civil war. The first path had been the party's general policy since Lenin's times. The second path, the path of plundering the countryside and at the same time forcibly destroying the private sector in the cities, fitted in with Trotskiy's extremist views, which were later taken up by Stalin too.

The social utopia put forward by Stalin tended to see the new society as being built not by means of slowly, gradually overcoming class contradictions and differences, but by means of the simple, once-and-for-all "transformation" of classes and social groups that do not accord with the best ideals of liberated mankind. Therefore Stalin regarded the alliance of the working class and the peasantry not as the firm foundation of the new system, but as a kind of tactical ruse for temporary use, like the Brest peace. As early as spring 1927 Stalin spoke frankly and openly of this: "We need the alliance of workers and peasants not in order to preserve the peasantry as a class, but in order to transform it and remake it in a direction that meets the interests of the victory of socialist building."

At the time Stalin preferred not to talk about who would formulate those "interests" and how. But he was already tacitly trying on this role for himself....

The country celebrated the 10th anniversary of the revolution widely. A jubilee session of the USSR Central Executive Committee was held in Leningrad 15 through 20 October 1927.

Speaking at the session, V.V. Kuybyshev, chairman of the Supreme Council of the National Economy, said: "What results can we sum up?... It is only necessary to look at the basic facts and figures.... In the current year we have surpassed the prewar output of products (at prewar prices) by 6 percent.... the new economic policy promoted not only the development of industry, but also the development of agriculture. By 1927-1928 sown areas had almost reached prewar levels. The number of cattle exceeds the prewar level. In recent years the peasant farms have renewed agricultural implements. The peasantry is now devoting great attention to commercial crops."

Naturally, at the height of the festivities a victorious note was struck.

The country had entered the second decade of its history.

Economic

'Voskhod' Bank Collapse in Zurich Discussed

PM1307140588 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Jul 88 p 3

[Article by A. Nadzharov under "Postscript to Sentence" rubric: "Eldorado for Swindlers"]

[Text] A bank has collapsed in Zurich. First the losses ran into tens of millions. Then, after the details had been ascertained, this sum came to 0.5 billion Swiss francs. A bankruptcy of this kind is no ordinary phenomenon for Western business circles. But it was not even the sum of the loss which attracted Western press attention but the fact that Voskhod Handelsbank was a Soviet bank.

For those who are not familiar with international financial relations, I shall say that the "Voskhod" bank was not the only Soviet credit institution overseas. There is the Moscow Narodnyy bank in London, the Eurobank in Paris, the Ostwesthandelsbank in Frankfurt. Like our other banks abroad they deservedly enjoy a solid reputation. Their leaders' commercial acumen, their punctiliousness in executing the commitments they have taken on, and, the main thing, the Soviet state's open support have made our financial experts welcome partners in currency deals.

Initially the "Voskhod" bank enjoyed the same reputation until, in the late seventies, Yuriy Karnaukh, the president of its board, formed a link with one Werner Piterkhans [surname as published]. Working in the bank, the latter made extremely advantageous deals, which earned him considerable trust among the leadership. Indeed, in Switzerland too this man enjoyed a reputation as an intelligent and worthy citizen. But in fact in this "useful" employee the Soviet bank had acquired an inveterate rogue. Here is what the Swiss magazine BILANZ wrote in late 1985: "When Piterkhans was caught it emerged that he had incurred losses to his bank of 800 million to 1 billion francs. This story was confirmed by the fact that the leader of the Soviet delegation which arrived to investigate the incident was so shaken by the size of the losses that he scarcely managed to reach his hotel, and died there."

Indeed, A. Makeyev, deputy chairman of the board of the USSR Gosbank, an honest man, most likely did not withstand the shock caused by his familiarization on the spot with the activity of the "Voskhod" leadership. A little earlier, anticipating something unpleasant, he had told his colleague V. Dzhidzhikhadze: "Things there are going very badly; there must be some gang operating." He said this having only the official report data in mind.

The facts which Makeyev encountered in Zurich were literally murderous. And it was not even a matter of Piterkhans—the Swiss authorities did not see his personal enrichment, although there were suspicions that through this dealer an entire financial mafia was robbing "Voskhod." The point was the behavior of Yu. Karnaukh, the president of the board, and some of his colleagues, which went far beyond generally accepted ideas of the Soviet citizen's seemliness, honor, and dignity.

Makeyev's attention was probably attracted by numerous bills for very expensive watches, which were bought at the bank's expense and sent to persons unknown in Moscow. He was surprised by the restaurant and store bills which came under the heading of business expenses. And the bank's acquisition of an expensive painting by a well-known Swiss artist looked very strange.

Indeed today we can provide an explanation for these "oddities." You only have to recall the years which have been called the stagnation years. Endless toasts, festivities, generously spiced with gifts—all this occurred. There was also the practice, now condemned and one which shamed the name of the Soviet man and Communist, of various gifts and "signs of attention" for the bosses and at state expense—using the people's money. At the investigation Karnaukh was asked:

"For whom were the expensive watches and the picture intended?"

"The leaders of the Foreign Trade Bank, the USSR Gosbank...."

These were not the only people to figure in the investigation materials. One former USSR Gosbank leader cited the names Grishin, Brezhnev, Kirilenko, and Kunayev. That is how deep the infection of present giving had penetrated. Now it is hard to say whether the loyally offered presents reached each of their recipients. Some of the bank employees persuaded the investigation that they had done everything to protest when they received gifts from their subordinates and had even demanded that the most expensive be taken back. When they saw that these "demands" were not being heeded, they personally gave these gifts to the State Fund. Indeed, many expensive presents, including the notorious painting, were in fact given to the state. But they were not given in the heat of righteous anger but only years later—under the eyes of the investigation.

Often the gifts were made before the eyes of the bank's foreign employees who filed in the "Voskhod" accounts what were according to Karnaukh accounts amended by he did not know whom for his drinking sessions and for gifts to leaders.

The bank leadership's negligence and adventurism were also reflected in the institution's main activity. Essentially unloading onto Piterkhans the matter entrusted to him, Karnaukh went about forging his own happiness everywhere. Meanwhile, "Voskhod" lost its good reputation. As the magazine BILANZ wrote, the Soviet bank was carrying out very risky operations. Often "Voskhod" acted as an intermediary link between respectable banks and financial riff-raff. The magazine mentioned a deal which "Voskhod" concluded with an obviously unsound financial contracting party 12 hours before the latter's official bankruptcy. As a result it lost 1 million francs—a sum, it later emerged, which was not the maximum in the losses our state incurred in Switzerland.

The magnitude of the trust in Karnaukh and others involved in the "Voskhod" case was colossal. Just as the cynicism with which they treated this trust was colossal.

Feeling the broad shoulders of the strong of this world, letting themselves go increasingly, these people traded their honor, conscience, and duty for the excitement of the gambler counting on a lucky chance—forgetting here that they were taking their stakes from state money. The excitement ruled them day and night, and day and night they gambled millions, forgetting to whom these millions belonged and what these funds were worth to the people. What did they care for the state's problems! What did they care for the people's life. They were just empty sounds.... The most dangerous form of man's degradation is all-permissiveness augmented by a sense of his own importance. It is no accident that family names each more famous than the last constantly flash through the case materials.... "Esteemed people" for whom everything was possible. What is permitted to Jove!...

How could it be, the reader rightly wonders, after all each of us is made responsible for wasting R10 yet here there are hundreds of millions being written off [v invalyute]! Why did the law not protect the state from such losses? Well, it did protect it. Only this protection proved to be of a very low order. The point is that a decision of the USSR Gosbank board obliged its foreign departments to conduct business in such a way as to seek the complete elimination of operations with no commercial basis and connected with an increased risk.

In fact that meant currency and financial deals had to be concluded within a day: It would buy, sell, and make a profit. There is also a special commercial risk fund to cover a loss which, when there is a time restriction, provides a guarantee against any unpleasantness. But Karnaukh, in violation of the rules, made purchases for a whole year, counting on eventually making a large sum on the expected change in the market situation. And then—for winners are not condemned—the bosses would close their eyes to his "games." The calculation was not justified.

There followed a new adventure. Karnaukh put forward the story of "an imperialist plot." Why not? After all, Piterkhans' brother lived in the United States. He later had to abandon this story because imperialism was no obstacle to his own bungling.

What was left? There remained Piterkhans' unclear ties with the Americans which, the Swiss press wrote, had nonetheless taken place. There remained an extremely unpleasant situation for the Swiss Confederation's Banking Commission. It was obviously not reassured by the suspended sentence of 20 months' imprisonment passed on Piterkhans since the "Voskhod" affair had shown the low level of effectiveness of the bank control for which this commission is responsible.

As for the effectiveness of our control of financial activity, then in the opinion of an official spokesman for the Swiss authorities, "the Soviet bank was a veritable Eldorado for swindlers. It was clumsy and badly organized, including on the internal control plane."

It is shaming. But we must pass through this to put our own house in order. That is why we have decided to make this story public. But even here we have encountered considerable difficulties. For instance, we have been unable to make use of the materials of the legal investigation: It was held in camera. A screen of secrecy covered the affair even at the stage of the collection of data, making secret what is already widely known in the West and has been made much of in the Western press for several years.

Now, after a protracted investigation of 3 and ½ years, the trial has taken place. The chief accused, Karnaukh, whose negligence caused the state tremendous material and moral damage, has been relieved of responsibility under an amnesty—as a second group invalid and the holder of two orders who has received state orders for...his activity as bank leader.

Well, what about the commercial partners who entrusted their money to our bank in Switzerland? The "Voskhod" shareholders—the USSR Gosbank and the foreign trade bank—were of course concerned for them. They have made a deposit of 300 million francs in the Swiss national bank, thereby avoiding auctioning off "Voskhod." But even this gigantic sum will not make good the harm which we all suffer, which our state suffers, when something else is put up for auction: the Soviet person's dignity.

Understandably, if our country had not covered the shortfall, tremendous harm would also have been caused to Switzerland's financial center. It is not surprising that Hermann Bodenmann, president of the Swiss Confederation's Banking Commission has high praise for Soviet bankers. In subsequent banking deals, not, of course, like those described above, we can boldly use this testimonial as a guarantee.

Agricultural

Progress of Feed Harvest, Storage Reported

PM1307143788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jul 88 Second Edition p 1

[Report by Ye. Grigoryev under the rubric "Harvest-88: What Lies Behind the Figures": "Will the Diet Be Richer?"]

[Text] The USSR State Committee for Statistics reports that farms in the Central Asian republics, the Transcaucasus, southern Ukraine, and the North Caucasus are harvesting grain. By 4 July 2.8 million hectares of grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) had been cut. The first batches of newly harvested grain have been dispatched to the state. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes are tending row crops and laying in feed. By the beginning of July 33.5 million hectares of sown and natural grasses had been cut. Some 24 million tonnes of hay have been procured, along with 33 million tonnes of haylage and 1.6 million tonnes of grass meal.

How do these figures compare with last season? As it stands, 1.5 million fewer hectares of grasses have been cut. Particularly in Kazakhstan and the RSFSR's non-Chernozem zone. Stocks of hay and grass meal are not growing as quickly, either, although kolkhozes and sovkhozes are to a considerable extent plugging the gap with haylage. Nearly 1 million tonnes more than last year have been laid in. As a result total stocks are now roughly the same as they were a year ago. But if we want to make progress, such criteria are scarcely warranted. What, then, is preventing more fruitful work?

It is bad weather again. In many regions rain is hampering the haymaking. Nevertheless, farms in Lithuania have procured more than one-half of the requisite hay and grass meal and two-thirds of the haylage. But the Mari ASSR and Gorkiy Oblast have essentially only just started haymaking.

Second sowings are another reserve. This year kolkhozes and sovkhozes plan to increase the area of second sowings from 1.9 million to nearly 4 million hectares. Farms in the Ukraine and North Caucasus are convincingly demonstrating the expediency of this move. But many kolkozes and sovkhozes—in Uzbekistan, for example—hardly bother at all with second sowings of feed crops.

Mass silage procurement is about to take place. Are there sufficient capacities and harvesting equipment? Not everywhere are they in plentiful supply, apparently. Many combines, for example, have still not been overhauled in Turkmenia and Kursk, Kostroma, and Ryazan Oblasts. Provision of standard storage facilities is poor in Tajikistan, Armenia, and Tula and Chimkent Oblasts.

The area of natural hayfields and pastures is truly enormous. Their verdant expanses cover over 300 million hectares—nearly one-sixth of our country's territory. Given good harvests, the meadows could provide for all livestock units' needs. At the moment, however, they provide only one-third of the feed. That is very little!

Why? Meadow productivity is extremely poor. The average amount of hay obtained per hectare is 6-8 quintals. Vast areas are covered with scrub or are marshland. In Lotoshinskiy Rayon, Moscow Oblast, in recent years alone 3,000 of the 12,000 hectares of natural meadows and pastures have become overgrown with trees.

It must be mentioned that the USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Measures To Increase the Productivity of Natural Meadows and Pastures" has not altered the attitude toward meadows of, for example, the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources. Last year the fundamental improvement of hayfields and pastures was envisaged, with an area of 2,593,000 hectares being converted to meadowland. The work has been carried out on only 1,575,000 hectares.

The same criticism can be leveled at the machine builders. Over the past 4 years they have failed to meet the target on the production of marsh plows, alkali soil rippers, feed crop drills, and rock collectors.

If today you were to visit the cultivated pastures of the "Krasnaya Poyma" experimental farm in Moscow Oblast you would marvel at the mighty sea of grass. Each hectare of meadowland provides 7-9 tonnes of feed units. Hence the excellent milk yields, reaching around 5,000 kilograms per cow.

Irrigated pastures have for a long time provided the reliable foundation for forage stocks in many areas of the country. But the rate at which they are organized still falls markedly short of livestock raising's needs. Reclamation workers are being criticized by, for example, livestock raisers in Uzbekistan, the Ukraine, and Belorussia. Meadows, as is known, are responsive to fertilizers. But they are being allocated extremely small quantities.

Summer is approaching its zenith. And its pulse is quickening, so to speak. After all, as is known, it is the harvest campaign that feeds the year.

Agricultural Developments for 7-13 Jul Noted

LD1407042088 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 7-13 July. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

7 July:

According to the data of the USSR State Statistical Committee, by Monday, 4 July, grain and pulses had been harvested from 2.8 million hectares and had been threshed on 2 million hectares. (0104)

Wheat and barley harvesting has started in Kirghizia on nearly 500,000 hectares. (1330)

Grass has been mowed on 400,000 hectares in Kirghizia. (1330)

8 July:

Haymaking has started on the alpine and subalpine meadows in the Central Caucasus in Northern Ossetia. In the autonomous republic, mountain meadows occupy one-third of the natural farmland, 300,000 hectares. (0000)

9 July:

So far hay has been mowed from 150,000 hectares in the Ryazan Oblast. This is 22 percent of the planned amount and less than at this time last year owing to the drought. Haymaking is now being hampered by daily wet weather. (0400)

10 July:Corn harvesting has started in Tajikistan where approximately 38,000 hectares are sown to corn this year. (0204)

11 July

No noteworthy items reported.

12 July:

Kashkadarya Oblast, Uzbekistan, has overfulfilled its plan for selling grain to the state, as have Namangan, Bukhara, Syrdarya, and Fergana Oblasts. Uzbekistan has already delivered over 270,000 tonnes of wheat and barley to the state. (0204)

13 July:

In Tajikistan 100,000 tonnes of grain have been harvested to date. (0204)

Grain crops harvest has started in 12 union republics. Feed crops harvest continues—more than 33.5 million tonnes of hay and almost 41 million tonnes of haylage have been laid in by farms so far. (1800)

Scientific

'Cosmos-1958' Satellite Launched 14 Jul

LD1507074288 Moscow TASS in English 0727 GMT 15 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 15 TASS—An artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1958, was launched by a Cosmos booster rocket in the Soviet Union on July 14.

The satellite carried scientific equipment for continuing the exploration of outer space.

The satellite was put into orbit with the following parameters:

Initial period of revolution—92.4 minutes,
maximum distance from the earth's surface (in apogee)—417 kilometres,
minimum distance from the earth's surface (in perigee)—375 kilometres,
inclination of the orbit—65.8 degrees.

Apart from the scientific equipment, the satellite carries a radio system for accurate measurement of orbit elements, and a radio telemetric system for transmitting back to the earth data on the work of the instruments and scientific equipment.

The on-board equipment is operating normally.

The coordination-and-computer centre is processing the incoming data.

Demonstration of Martian 'Rover' Vehicle Model

LD1307212988 Moscow TASS in English 1232 GMT 13 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 13 TASS—TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov writes:

A small six-wheeler which moved along stony ground, approached a nearly vertical stone wall. Its front axle climbed atop, hooked the edge with broad ribbed wheels and pulled closer the second axle. Several seconds later the entire machine crawled atop and rolled on. This scene from a film on model tests of a Soviet Martian rover was witnessed by participants in the international seminar on a long-term programme of Mars' explorations which is under way at the space explorations institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The Martian rover is an element of the Soviet 1994 Martian expedition. Specialists from many countries will take part in developing equipment for an automatic station which will orbit Mars, as well as for a Martian rover, a balloon, weather stations and sensor penetrators with scientific instrumentation, which will dig into the planet's soil.

Valeriy Gromov, one of the authors of the Martian rover, told TASS that designers faced difficult engineering tasks. The point is that the Martian terrain is much more difficult to negotiate than the moon's surface. The Martian rover will have to overcome stone labyrinths, to travel along steep slopes of hills and channels of dried-up rivers. Scientists have worked on versions of various wheel, caterpillar, walking and combined undercarriages.

Researchers chose a six-wheel chassis for the time being. The surface of wheels takes nearly the entire width of the machine. The rover has no platform-type frame, and, therefore, it will not hitch any ground. [sentence as received] Each wheel can move relative [as received] the longitudinal axis, therefore the rover can easily negotiate piles of boulders, scaling even the highest of them. If boulders get between wheels, it rolls back and makes a turn. Now the model is distance-controlled by an operator. An artificial intellect will be developed for the real thing.

The Martian rover will have a radioisotope power pack which will enable it to operate for a year and to cover several hundred kilometres of the planet's surface. The design weight of the machine is 200 kg, and the payload will make up 30-40 kg. A 500-kg version is also being contemplated, with the weight of instrumentation being 100 kg. It is planned to place instrumentation for TV filming, weather measurements, analyses of chemical and physical properties of Martian soil in two containers over axles. Provision is also made for protecting instruments sensitive to radiation of the power pack.

European Cooperation in Phobos Probes Cited

LD1307211288 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT 13 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 13 TASS—The current flight of two Soviet unmanned probes to the Martian moon Phobos is only a first step to carry out a Soviet program for studying Mars, which Soviet scientists believe should climax with a cosmonaut landing on the red planet somewhere in 2015 to 2017.

The first of the probes to Phobos blasted off from the Baykonur space port on July 7, followed by its sister craft last night. Their on-board equipment has been developed by scientists of 13 countries and the European Space Agency.

France, a TASS correspondent has been told at the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Institute of Space Studies, has been among the more active participants.

It has provided several systems and instruments for the Martian orbiters and for a research lander which is expected to continue gathering data about Phobos for a year.

These include an ion gun for probing the moon's surface and analyzing its soil.

Another instrument, an infra-red spectrometer, is to be used to explore the mineral composition of Mars and Phobos and the thermal physics and reflecting properties of their surface.

The scientist in charge of the spectrometer project, Alain Soufflot from the French Institute of Space Astrophysics, told TASS that the studies of Phobos, which is most likely a captured asteroid, will provide unique material about the early phases in the formation of the solar system.

He said French scientists are going to take an active part also in devising equipment for a Soviet automatic station to fly to Mars in 1994.

A large number of scientific experiments has been prepared by West German experts as well. These include a laser-aided analysis of soil chemistry.

It will be carried out by a laser firing a thin beam on Phobos surface to vaporize a tiny spot of its soil whose particles should then reach the low-flying orbiter's instruments.

According to Dr Jochen Kissel of West Germany's Max-Planck Institute of Nuclear Physics, the most challenging job has been to enable this kind of probing to be automatically regulated depending on soil characteristics, the distance to surface and the laser's operating conditions. It has been fulfilled by dint of microprocessor technology.

Sweden is yet another participant in the Phobos mission. Professor Kerstin Fredga of the Swedish Committee for Space Studies said that an instrument contrived by scientists in her country will make it possible for the first time to obtain data on the distribution of charged particles in the magnetosphere of Mars, its structure and dynamics.

The experiment is a logical followup to earlier Soviet-Swedish studies focusing on space plasma.

Foreign Insurance Representatives Visit Baykonur

LD1307211988 Moscow TASS in English 1429 GMT 13 Jul 88

[Text] Baykonur Cosmodrome July 13 TASS—TASS special correspondent Yuriy Shevyakov reports:

The visit to the Baykonur Cosmodrome in Kazakhstan by representatives of leading world companies engaged in space launch risk insurance testify to serious attention on the part of Western business circles for Soviet rocket technology. Having arrived at the cosmodrome by air on Tuesday, experts from the United States, Britain, West Germany and Italy familiarized themselves with carrier rockets, the technology of their preparation for launching.

Late at night, local time, they witnessed the launch on the Soviet automatic station Phobos-2.

"The interest in Soviet space technology on the part of big foreign firms is linked, above all, with its high technological standards," a TASS correspondent have been told by Mikhail Safronov, deputy chairman of the Soviet joint stock insurance company Ingosstrakh. This was also noted by representatives of such world known insurance companies as International Technology (USA), the Muenchener Rueckversicherungs-Gesellschaft (FRG), Aussicurazione Generali (Italy), Crowley Warren (Britain), who arrived in the USSR.

Mikhail Safronov said, among other things, that Soviet specialists "can guarantee the launch of a satellite or an orbital station to any pre-set orbit". He also said that "the number of foreign organisations willing to launch their vehicles into orbit with the help of Soviet carrier rockets, has already reached 150."

Mikhail Safronov said that "major difficulties have not been overcome on the way of development of commercial relations." The matter is, he explained that the cost of space vehicle launchings runs into tens and sometimes hundreds million dollars. For some companies the launch risk insurance is a too risky affair. "No contract of such a kind can be signed without solving the question of launch insurance," said Mikhail Safronov. "Cooperation with foreign partners is for the Soviet side a realistic way of solving this issue. Mutual benefit is obvious here. The visit of foreign insurance experts to the Soviet cosmodrome is exactly linked with such prospects. Soviet space rocket technology's emerging in the foreign market and its recognition by the international insurance market will stimulate not only the development of world cosmonautics but will also help strengthen the spirit of business cooperation and confidence among nations".

U.S. 'Ban' Creates 'Impasse'

LD1407231888 Moscow TASS in English 1302 GMT 14 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 14 TASS—The manager of a Munich-based insurance company said his company would like to pool resources with Soviet partners to insure space launches.

Hartmut Hesse was speaking in a TASS interview right after coming back from the Baykonur Cosmodrome in Kazakhstan where he was given a possibility to see booster rockets, spacecraft and launch pad facilities.

"The technical standards of Soviet rocketry are impressive. They are explained by Soviet space experts having always gone their own way," he said.

"Technologies developed by them make it possible confidently to perform challenging missions in space exploration and use orbital stations and satellites on a commercial bases.

"My company is prepared to cooperate with Soviet partners to insure space launches against accidents," the West German businessman said.

Executives from leading insurance companies from the United States, Britain and Italy, which specialize in space activities, all expressed themselves in favor of such cooperation with Soviet partners as well after visiting Baykonur.

There are difficulties standing in the way of this cooperation, however, and most of them are due to the U.S. posture.

Yevgeniy Sherstobitov, chief of the commercial department of the Soviet space agency Glavkosmos, explained that most Western satellites carry components and instruments of U.S. make, but the United States has imposed an embargo on deliveries of high-tech products to the USSR.

This is why if a satellite contains even just one high-tech element, it falls under the ban. "The result is an impasse: The USSR is approached by organizations from many countries asking us to launch their satellites for scientific and commercial purposes, but we cannot meet these requests," Sherstobitov said.

He added that the U.S. explains the embargo by fears of letting its technological secrets go, but "the argument is untenable since the USSR has treaded its own path in space technology development, evolving equipment in a class quite of its own."

"Besides, U.S. authorities have been told that satellites brought into the USSR could be exempted from customs clearance and taken to launch pads in sealed containers escorted by the clients' representatives.

"But the U.S. has still not agreed," the Glavkosmos official said.

"This policy is directded not only against the USSR but also against all countries that do not have space systems of their own.

"It goes counter to the spirit of international cooperation and the need to improve mutual understanding and increase trust among countries," he said.

Military

Yazov, Lizichev Address Graduation Ceremonies

PM1507085788 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jul 88 First Edition pp 1, 3

[Unattributed report: "Graduation From Military Academies"]

[Text] The latest graduation of students has taken place at the K.Ye. Voroshilov Military Academy of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces.

The audience was addressed by Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister. Congratulating the graduates on the completion of their studies, the defense minister noted that many famous military leaders and commanders and eminent military scientists have graduated from this academy. The present academy graduates are continuing and increasing its fame.

The present graduation from the Military Academy of the General Staff, Army General D.T. Yazov noted, is taking place at an important, crucial time. The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference completed its work a few days ago. It creatively developed the strategic course to achieve the comprehensive, revolutionary renewal of Soviet society and accelerate its socioeconomic development and armed the party with program decisions. Their implementation is of key significance for the fate of our motherland and for the task of further enhancing the prestige and authority of world socialism and increasing the effectiveness of the peace-loving socialist foreign policy which is imbued with new thinking. Fully equipped with the knowledge imparted to them, the academy graduates must immediately become involved in the general work to implement the party conference decisions and consolidate, deepen, and build on restructuring in the sector to which they are assigned.

The defense minister went on to describe the contemporary international situation and the conflict between positive and negative trends in its development and stressed the need in defense building to take account of the militarist preparations of imperialist reactionary forces. He explained the nature of qualitative parameters for ensuring the effectiveness of this building and ways to implement them in the everyday practical activity of military cadres. The defense minister drew particular attention to the importance of organizing all troop life and activity in strict conformity with regulations.

Responsible for conveying party policy to the Armed Forces, officers must organize and direct the process of democratization in the Army and Navy. The heart of this process lies in rallying, uniting, and involving all officers, soldiers, and seamen in the general active, productive work to improve combat readiness and the quality of training and strengthen discipline.

Diplomas and insignia were awarded to the new detachment of graduates from the V.I. Lenin Military Political Academy. A formal meeting dedicated to this event was addressed by Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

He conveyed greetings to those present from Army General D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister, who cordially congratulated the graduates on the successful completion of their studies.

In his address, Army General A.D. Lizichev noted that the present graduation is special. The students' studies have coincided with a most complex period of smashing old ideas and establishing new ones in the theory and practice of solving the revolutionary tasks of restructuring in our country. The years spent in the academy have given political workers the opportunity to appreciate the depth and scale of the current transformations and their irreversible, assertive nature. On their return to the Army and Navy, made richer by their new knowledge and inspired by the decisions of the 19th all-union party conference, officers and political workers must immediately conduct extensive propaganda of the party conference directives and strive for real results.

The main quality that a political worker must now possess, Army General A.D. Lizichev emphasized, is, first, the ability to individualize the whole training and education process. The time of general slogans is now in the past and we must learn to work with every individual separately and realize his potential. Second, a political worker must foster in himself and his subordinates a sense of party principle and high exactingness. Every Communist must now wage war on oversimplification, indulgence, deception, demagoguery, and relations that do not comply with regulations.

Graduation ceremonies were also held at other military training institutions.